

LENIN AND PROBLEMS OF LIBERATION MOVEMENT

HX

632

A1

W9

NO. 436


Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





LENIN AND PROBLEMS OF LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1969



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries



Introduction

The national-liberation movement against imperialist oppression is part of the current world historical process. With the working-class struggle in the advanced capitalist countries and the anti-imperialist policy pursued by the socialist nations, it makes a considerable contribution to the revolutionary remaking of society.

Ways of waging it and the forms it assumes are determined by the many and diverse conditions in the different countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The difficulties facing it are numerous and of both an objective and subjective nature.

It is therefore incumbent upon all those who lead or play an active role in the national-liberation struggle to make a deep study of the historic experience of the working-class movement and gain an all-round mastery of basic Marxist-

Leninist theory. Marxist teaching on the working-class and national-liberation struggles allied creatively and dialectically with the specific conditions of the anti-imperialist movement, makes it possible to work out correct strategy and tactics for struggle in general and for each separate phase of the struggle.

Great credit is due to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (the centenary of his birth will be celebrated in 1970) who elaborated the strategy and tactics of the national-liberation movement.

Marxism appeared in the mid-19th century, when in the more advanced European countries contradictions between the exploiters and the exploited had sharpened and a working class had emerged, a force able more consistently to resist social oppression. The founders of this teaching—Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels—proved that “since the conditions of life of the proletariat sum up all the conditions of life of society today in all their inhuman acuity”,¹ the social liberation of the working class is also the social liberation of all the oppressed and exploited. Since then scientific socialism has become the dominant theory guiding the struggles of the working class and the broad, non-proletarian strata.

Marxism, for the first time, explained the world scientifically and charted ways, means and conditions for reconstructing it. Marxism showed in a most general form the laws that govern social development.

Lenin's name is associated with the new epoch in the development of Marxism, which began at the end of the 19th and in the early 20th centuries, when capitalism entered its highest, imperialist, stage. The economic and political conditions of the new historic period and the achie-

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels. “The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Critique”, M., 1956, p. 52.

vements in science and engineering called for further creative development of Marxism and Marxist philosophy. This Lenin did.

Lenin's service to history is that he, basing himself on the general laws regulating social development discovered by Marx, revealed the essence of imperialism in all its aspects. In his book, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), he defined imperialism as having a three-fold nature—that of monopoly, parasitic and moribund capitalism. Because of this, imperialism is the last stage of capitalism and the eve of a socialist revolution.

Monopoly domination means sharply increased exploitation of the working people, which leads to an intensification of the class struggle waged by the working class and its ally—the peasants—against their exploiters. The monopolies exacerbate contradictions between the capitalist countries, too. This results in imperialist wars.

Monopoly domination means division of the world among a handful of imperialist powers which turn other countries into objects of exploitation—either colonies, or economically dependent, if formally independent, nations. Lenin pointed out that by the early 20th century “capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of ‘advanced’ countries.”¹

The intensification of colonial oppression by the monopolies provokes an upsurge of the national-liberation movement.

In the mid-19th century capitalism as a system was progressing, therefore Marx and Engels did not believe a socialist revolution could

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 22, p. 191.

triumph in an individual country, since it would be crushed by the concerted efforts of the capitalist countries. However, in their subsequent works, Marx and Engels voiced a supposition that revolution could begin in separate countries. Analysis of the imperialist stage of capitalism enabled Lenin to develop this idea of Marx and Engels further. Lenin concluded that socialism might be victorious in separate countries. As a result, several links would be torn from the capitalist system. This process, Lenin pointed out, would embrace a whole historical epoch.

Lenin proved that social revolutions are multiform both in character and the motive forces (bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic and socialist). He believed that various types of revolution correspond to definite historical stages which do not succeed one another haphazardly, at somebody's whim, but correspond to the level of socio-economic development in the country.

National-liberation revolutions occupy a specific place among revolutions. They are bourgeois-democratic revolutions aimed at gaining national sovereignty, abolishing feudal relations, establishing political democracy and paving the way for a transition to the next, higher, stage.

In the works *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* (1905), *The Lessons of the Revolution* (1910), *Lessons of the Moscow Uprising* (1906) and others, Lenin showed that along with the toiling masses in town and country, numerous intermediate, petty-bourgeois strata and democratically-minded bourgeoisie take part in a bourgeois-democratic revolution. However, the only force strong enough to win a decisive victory is that made up of the proletariat and the peasantry. Already during the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the proletariat as the leading force can, by rallying the bulk of the peasantry to its side, abolish land ownership

by the feudal-landowner and thus strike a blow at large-scale private property.

A trend developed in the Russian revolutionary movement of the late 19th century whose defenders denied that struggle by the working class was the decisive factor in the triumph of revolution. Instead they assigned the main role in the revolution to the peasants. Lenin counterposed the policy of splitting the peasants from the working class with one of alliance in the revolutionary battles to come.

Lenin's works *What "the Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (1894), *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1896-99) and others contain a consistently Marxist analysis of capitalist development in the countryside, and denounce the policy of divorcing the workers' movement from the peasants'. Lenin's works *The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy* (1902), *To the Rural Poor* (1903), *Revision of the Agrarian Programme of the Workers' Party*, (1906) *The Tax in Kind* (1921) and many others urge the need for an alliance between the working class and the peasants.

Lenin convincingly proved that the peasants' future is inseparably linked with the working-class revolutionary struggle and that they are the workers' allies. The struggle for land, against the landowners, revolutionises the peasant masses, draws them more actively into the democratic revolution. This is the basis for their alliance with the working class.

Lenin devoted serious study to the specific features inherent in the revolutions in colonial and dependent countries, especially those arising from the oppression to which these countries are subjected by the world capitalist system, from the peculiarities of their social systems. Lenin developed a theory on the strategy and tactics

of the national-liberation revolution. The gist of it is a united anti-imperialist front of the nations.

Considering the colonial system as the inevitable product of capitalism, Marx emphasised the close connection between the revolutionary struggle of the working people in the advanced countries and the liquidation of colonial domination. In the new conditions, when capitalism had entered its imperialist stage, Lenin proved that the liberation movement of the oppressed nations is bound to combine with the socialist movement of the working class to form a single revolutionary front against the common enemy—imperialism. Lenin developed this idea in such works as *Critical Remarks on the National Question* (1913), *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (1914), *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (1916), etc.

The principles of proletarian internationalism, the struggle against great-power chauvinism and nationalism, every support by the working class in the imperialist states for the liberation movement of oppressed nations are, according to Lenin, basic to the formation of a common revolutionary front. There is no solving the national question in the interests of the people without observing the principles of proletarian internationalism, without the mutual solidarity of the workers and the toiling people of all nations, without joint actions and fraternal cooperation.

Of truly historic significance is Lenin's theory that it is possible for backward countries, in which pre-capitalist relations prevail, to embark, under certain conditions and as the result of a liberation revolution, upon the road of socialist construction, by-passing the capitalist stage of development. To carry this through, the people that freed themselves must get every kind of as-

sistance from the victorious working class in the economically developed countries.

Lenin generalised the experience of the working-class struggle in Russia and showed the need to combine various forms and methods in revolutionary struggle from peaceful strikes and demonstrations up to resolute, energetic offensive operations, including an armed uprising. Warning revolutionaries against rash actions, Lenin emphasised that an uprising could be launched only if there existed the prerequisites for its success.

Lenin performed a great service to the world revolutionary movement by exposing opportunism and sectarianism. The opportunists claimed that the time of revolutionary upheavals was past and that capitalism would smoothly and automatically, by virtue of objective laws, develop into socialism. The opportunists renounced the class struggle, forcing the working class to make concessions to and compromise with the bourgeoisie. Lenin showed explicitly in his works that socialism cannot be attained in this way. The past decades corroborated Lenin's predictions.

Dogmatism and sectarianism are equally dangerous to revolutionary struggle. Sectarian revolutionism is shallow and unstable. Its followers lack proletarian self-control, discipline and staunchness, and are not organised.

Developing Marx's teachings Lenin elaborated an integrated theory on a party of the new type—the Marxist revolutionary party. To accomplish a socialist revolution, the working class must be organised, Lenin emphasised. The working class must create a militant organisation, i.e., a vanguard. His theory on the working class party can be found in his major works, *What Is to Be Done?* (1902), and *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* (1904).

The working-class party is closely linked with its class and through it with all the exploited. Lenin said that the party must lead the working-class struggle, generalise the experience of the revolutionary movement and collectively develop a progressive theory. The party must work out strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle by analysing the life of society. Lenin stressed that the party can correctly assess life in a society only on the basis of a scientific revolutionary theory, that is on Marxism. A party ceases to be militant if it does not unite its ranks on the basis of a common ideology and strict discipline, obligatory for all its members.

Having proved, theoretically, the inevitability of a socialist revolution, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party led Russia's working class and toiling peasants to its victory. The building of socialism in the Soviet Union—a tempestuous development of industry, achievements in collectivised agriculture and cultural successes—is the implementation of Lenin's ideas.

The victory over the aggressive fascist bloc in the Second World War greatly accelerated the world revolutionary process. The world socialist community emerged. The imperialist colonial system collapsed. The social system which was created in accordance with the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin became the mainstay of the world revolutionary process.

Leninism came into existence as a successor to Marxism. Marxism-Leninism is an integrated doctrine which develops through generalisation of current experience, that of the world communist, workers' and national-liberation movements. Leninism is a new, higher stage of Marxism, Marxism of the 20th century, Marxism of the modern epoch. It is further developed in the theory and revolutionary practice of communist and workers' parties, in programme documents

drawn up by the collective effort of the world communist movement. Leninism has a strong appeal to all Marxist parties, the world working class and all progressive humanity seeking solutions to urgent social and political problems. Lenin's ideas, communist ideas, have become the leading ideas, the great motive force of today.

LENIN'S TEACHING ON THE UNITED FRONT OF ANTI-IMPERIALIST FORCES

In his article "Backward Europe and Advanced Asia" Lenin pointed out that "*hundreds of millions* of people are awakening to life, light and freedom."¹ Regarding the movement of the colonial and dependent nations towards socialism as a component of one revolutionary process he noted that "the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism."²

Lenin's teaching on the national-liberation movement is of practical value to the peoples of the East because it is a revolutionary theory adapted to the historical conditions that have taken shape in the colonial and dependent countries as a result of age-long oppression. These conditions are, first, the predominantly peasant composition of the population and, second, the smallness of the working class, the bearer of proletarian ideology.

In a speech in November 1919 to delegates to

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 100.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East Lenin said: "You are confronted with a task which has not previously confronted the communists of the world: relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not against capitalism."¹

Proceeding from these conditions Lenin elaborated a programme of revolutionary struggle for the peoples in the East which has retained its theoretical and practical significance to this day. The programme was outlined in the documents of the Second, Third and Fourth Congresses of the Communist International in which he participated and in several of his articles, talks and reports.

The problem of the place and role of the national bourgeoisie has existed since the very outset of the national-liberation struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies. What stand should the communist parties and other progressive forces take regarding the national bourgeoisie? Should they support them, and if so, to what extent and in what form? The correct answer to this question was and remains in great measure the key factor determining the outcome of revolutionary struggle for freedom.

Lenin emphasized that the bourgeoisie in the rising Eastern countries were in many respects different from the reactionary, conservative bourgeoisie in the West. "But in Asia," he emphasised, "there is *still* a bourgeoisie capable of championing sincere, militant, consistent democracy, a

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

worthy comrade of France's great men of Enlightenment and great leaders of the close of the eighteenth century." ¹ Lenin pointed out that "everywhere in Asia a mighty democratic movement is growing, spreading and gaining in strength. The bourgeoisie there is *as yet* siding with the people against reaction." ² This was explained, above all, by the fact that the national bourgeoisie were oppressed by imperialism, hence in matters of independence their own interests coincided with the common interests of the nation. Since the development of capitalism in the colonies and semi-colonies is retarded not only by foreign oppression but also by feudal survivals the national bourgeoisie are interested, to a certain extent, in ending feudal-landlord monopoly in land ownership.

History has since shown Lenin to be quite correct. For example, when the national bourgeoisie fought for political independence in India, Burma, Ceylon and some other countries they were acting in the interests of the entire nation. They played a revolutionary role in the fight against imperialism, for state sovereignty, and at present are making a tangible contribution to the economic development of their countries and the implementation of independent political courses.

The bourgeoisie of the dependent countries was capable of and in certain situations did lead a major section of the anti-imperialist forces, particularly the petty-bourgeois elements in town and country. In view of this Lenin said in his address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the East: "You will have to base yourselves on the bourgeois nationalism which is awakening, and must awaken,

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 18, p. 165.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 99-100.

among those peoples, and which has its historical justification.”¹

Lenin had to fight opposition to the national bourgeoisie by certain “left” elements in the communist movement. Those adhering to “left” trends, ignoring the objective laws of the revolutionary process and the specific features of the social struggle in the colonial and dependent countries refused to reckon with real facts. They claimed that the masses in the colonies were alien to the bourgeois-democratic movement, urged communists not to support it but rather to launch a struggle for socialist changes. During the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920 Lenin stressed the need for the Comintern to support the bourgeois-democratic national-liberation movements and thoroughly substantiated and elaborated his position in several articles and speeches. He pointed, in particular, to the need to differentiate between two trends—the national-reformist and the national-revolutionary—in the bourgeois-democratic movement in the oppressed countries and stressed the Comintern’s determination to support in the first place the revolutionary wing. This differentiation was essential since the liberal bourgeoisie joined the national-liberation movement in its early stage along with the revolutionary-democratic sections of the bourgeoisie. These liberal elements preferred to secure their aims by peaceful reforms and sought to channel the mass liberation movement along reformist lines, to divert it from resolute anti-imperialist struggle.

Regarding the communists’ support for bourgeois-democratic liberation movements it is well to recall what Lenin said: “The bourgeois nationalism of *any* oppressed nation has a general democratic content that is directed *against* op-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

pression, and it is this content that we *unconditionally* support. At the same time, we strictly distinguish it from the tendency towards national exclusiveness." "*Insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation,*" Lenin writes further, "fights the oppressor, we are always, in every case, and more strongly than anyone else, *in favour*, for we are the staunchest and the most consistent enemies of oppression. But insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation stands for *its own* bourgeois nationalism, we stand against." ¹

At the same time Lenin warned against the working people becoming absorbed in the national-liberation movement at the expense of their class tasks. He insisted on communists maintaining unconditional organisational and ideological independence when they entered political blocs with various national-bourgeois parties. Pointing to the dual nature of the national bourgeoisie, he warned against its tendency to come to terms with the imperialist bourgeoisie in order jointly to fight all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes. Lenin said: "...we, as Communists, should and will support bourgeois-liberation movements in the colonies only when they are genuinely revolutionary, and when their exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organising in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the masses of the exploited." ²

Lenin's polemic with the Indian communist Roy is quite well known. At the Second Comintern Congress Roy objected to an item in Lenin's report on the national and colonial questions, which stressed the need for all communist parties to help the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement. Roy held that the struggle for national independence had nothing in common with the

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 412, 411.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 242.

class struggle of the working people and insisted that the thesis on the support of the bourgeois-democratic movement for the liberation of colonies be deleted. Lenin opposed Roy's dangerous sectarian approach and emphasised that Indian communists were obliged to support the bourgeois-democratic movement without merging with it.

Thus the bourgeoisie of dependent countries possess both positive and negative features; their anti-imperialist tendencies flowing from their oppressed position are positive while their negative features are those which stem from their exploiter nature which urges them to attain their narrow class interests by any means available, including compromise with imperialism. These traits are displayed in different forms and to a varying degree depending on the specific historical situation and the balance of social and political forces in the given country. There is, however, a borderline dividing two periods in liberation struggle in which the bourgeoisie behave differently. This borderline is the attainment of national independence.

Prior to winning political independence the positive traits of the national bourgeoisie come to the fore, as a rule. The bourgeoisie emerge as active participants in the liberation struggle and they may share the leading role with other socio-political forces.

The negative features of the bourgeoisie become increasingly felt when political independence has been won and they are strengthening their economic and political positions. At this period they are not with the people, but above them and their chief concern is to maintain and strengthen their domination. This is especially typical of the upper sections of the bourgeoisie, primarily the big national monopolists who abandon the anti-imperialist front, become "business partners" of imperialism and finally find them-

selves in opposition to the progressive socio-political forces.

To be sure, the bourgeoisie do not cast off their revolutionary aspirations overnight, since political independence in itself does not resolve the economic contradictions between them and imperialism, does not automatically make them economically independent. That is why, in the newly independent countries, they preserve certain progressive, anti-imperialist trends for a certain period which may be quite long. The contribution to national-economic growth, protectionist measures aimed at narrowing the sphere of influence of foreign capital—these and other steps are generally taken in the national interests, but still the national bourgeoisie now seek to resolve their contradictions with imperialism through reform, not revolution. Their struggle against imperialism no longer extends beyond the competition between national and international capital. They become increasingly conscious that their interests have much in common with foreign capital and accordingly make wider use of various forms of cooperation with it, this time on much more advantageous terms.

Each country has its own peculiarities which stem from the historically conditioned levels of socio-economic and political development; the scope of feudal and pre-feudal survivals; the dependence on foreign capital; the degree of unity of the new social classes—the working class, the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie—and the relative strength of these classes; and finally the level of political awareness and organization of the progressive revolutionary forces. All these factors add up to give the political image of the national bourgeoisie.

In all newly liberated countries the bourgeoisie make up a far from homogeneous class, the various groups among them having their own

contradictions. This enables the progressive forces to pursue a flexible policy to various sections of the bourgeoisie with a view to strengthening and broadening the united anti-imperialist front.

How actively the bourgeoisie participate in the anti-imperialist front can be judged from the extent of their antagonism with the working class. In some countries two social battles are being waged in parallel—the general anti-imperialist struggle and the sharpening antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the working people, which is gradually turning into an organized political struggle. In other countries where the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are still both organisationally and ideologically weak their antagonism has not reached observable proportions. Various intermediate cases lie between these two extremes. The attitude of communist and other progressive forces to the national bourgeoisie should be in keeping with the concrete historical conditions in the given country, the balance of the class forces and the behaviour of the national bourgeoisie and their various groups.

An analysis of the role of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation movement is objectively necessary. A detailed study of progressive and reactionary trends protects communist and workers' parties from the mistake of either underestimating or overestimating the role of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation movement.

Mistakes of a right-opportunist kind are made when communists forget Lenin's words that the policy of the proletariat assists the bourgeoisie in some aspects only but never coincides with their policy. These mistakes stem from disregarding the political duality of the bourgeoisie, their inclination to falter and vacillate, to give up revolutionary methods of struggle and democratic forms of government once the first successes have been won. Opportunism usually takes the form

of preserving unity with the national bourgeoisie, at any cost and all stages of the liberation struggle. As a rule, this makes the workers' movement an appendage of the bourgeois-national movement. Historical experience shows that in such cases the bourgeoisie are able to pursue a reactionary and anti-democratic policy practically unopposed, while communists lose standing among the masses.

Mistakes of the opposite, left-sectarian, kind occur when communists lack the ability to single out sections of the bourgeoisie having a tendency to anti-imperialist struggle but identify them with those who hold pro-imperialist positions. As a result communists find themselves isolated from the masses and unable to influence the course of events.

It is pertinent in this connection to note the immense harm to the struggle for the unity of anti-imperialist forces in the newly independent countries caused by the adventurist policy of the Mao Tse-tung group. The Maoists completely ignore the anti-imperialist trends of the non-working sections of the population, including the national bourgeoisie. By attempting artificially to prod revolutionary processes in the developing countries they in no way help the proletariat achieve their goal but seriously reduce the chances of success of the general liberation struggle. The Maoist slogans about a "revolutionary situation" or "popular war," proclaimed regardless of the concrete conditions in a given country, lead revolutionary movements to adventurist schemes which are doomed to failure and resulting in a number of cases in the rout of all progressive forces in a country.

The present stage of the liberation movement offers a basis for wide unity among anti-imperialist forces. In view of the varying economic, social and political conditions in different coun-

tries in Asia, Africa and Latin America the composition of a united anti-imperialist front cannot be uniform. Yet in all cases it can and must include every class, section or group with anti-imperialist tendencies, whatever the ideological and political form they take. Such unity is a pledge of success in the complex and multi-faceted struggle for final liberation from imperialist oppression.

Lenin said that unity of the patriotic forces in each oppressed country should be combined with unity of all forces fighting imperialism on an international scale.

Experience shows conclusively that the basic condition for success in the struggle against imperialism is a strong alliance between the three components of the single world revolutionary process—the world socialist system, the proletarian movement in capitalist countries and the national-liberation struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America. No doubt each of these contingents of the world anti-imperialist front has its own revolutionary tasks, but these are closely linked in the common channel of anti-imperialist struggle. The workers and, peasants, all toiling people of all countries and continents face one strong and perfidious enemy, international imperialism. This enemy can be overcome only when the three currents of the world revolutionary movement join together to fight it.

How should they interact? In answering this question Lenin advanced the idea of the guiding role in the anti-imperialist struggle of the country where socialism had triumphed.

When the Soviet state, created and headed by Lenin, was the world's only socialist country it offered all-round fraternal assistance to the peoples in Eastern countries who were rising to fight for independence. The young land of Soviets, facing enormous economic hardships and

surrounded by aggressors, deemed it its duty to give what help it could to China, Turkey, Afghanistan and Mongolia in opposing imperialism. Soviet Russia provided funds, foodstuffs and arms. Soviet moral, political and diplomatic support was also of major importance.

The victory of socialist revolution in several countries created a world socialist system, a bulwark for the entire world revolutionary movement.

It was no accident that the disintegration of the imperialist colonial system reached its climax at a time when the Soviet Union had increased its economic might, other socialist states had come into being and the balance of forces on the international scene had changed radically. The socialist states give generously of their experience in economic and cultural construction to the developing countries. Hundreds of industrial, power, research and other projects have been completed or are underway in the developing countries with the assistance of socialist states. The Soviet Union alone is helping to build over 350 different kinds of enterprises in Asia and some 250 in Africa. The USSR has made available nearly 4,000 million roubles in credits to these countries. About 80 per cent of Soviet aid goes into the development of industry, transport and communications, i.e. to overcoming the economic backwardness inherited from the colonial past. The Soviet Union has provided credits, equipment and specialists for the construction in the developing countries of 30 plants and shops in ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, 45 engineering and metal-working works, 30 power stations, 20 chemical and oil-processing plants, 80 enterprises in the light and the food industries, 90 research and training establishments.

The economic and cultural attainments of world socialism have a powerful impact on inter-

national politics. The balance of forces on the world scene would not have changed in favour of socialism without its economic successes, and without these it would not have had the possibility of exerting a powerful positive influence on international relations, on the revolutionary and liberation struggle. The ability of the world revolutionary movement to repulse imperialism, to protect the revolutionary and national gains of the peoples hinges on the socialist countries' level of economic development.

The world system of socialism acts as a mighty accelerator of the class and revolutionary struggle in capitalist countries. The theses published by the CPSU Central Committee to mark the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution stressed that in our time the working class of any country can rely in its revolutionary struggle on the support of the victorious contingents of the workers' movement, the working men of the socialist countries, it can benefit from the experience of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, whose great accomplishments help the working people and their revolutionary vanguard.

The mounting economic and military growth of world socialism exerts an ever-growing influence on the development of the national-liberation movement. In our day freedom fighters in Asia, Africa and Latin America are aware that the national-liberation forces would have been incapable of winning state sovereignty, defending it from the attacks of neo-colonialism and launching a programme to attain economic independence had it not been for the world socialist community. The very existence of the socialist system has a powerful impact on the world revolutionary process. The example of the victorious socialist countries shows the peoples that imperialism is not invincible, that socialist society is not an

empty dream but a real and attainable goal. That is why the ideas of socialism are winning over millions of minds all over the world.

The leading role of the socialist system in the world revolutionary movement in no way diminishes the part played by other streams of the anti-imperialist struggle—the world working class and national-liberation movements. The working class in the advanced capitalist countries accounts for nearly half of the entire international labour force. In most of these countries the workers are very class-conscious, have militant long-standing traditions and strong parties steeled in class battles. More than half of all the communists of the non-socialist world live and fight in these countries.

What is the role played by the working class in the industrially advanced countries, which concentrate the bulk of the material, military and political resources of imperialism, in the world revolutionary process? Acting in alliance with other anti-imperialist forces it is gradually undermining the positions of imperialism in its very citadel.

The following data testifies to the immense importance in present-day conditions of the class struggle waged by the workers in capitalist countries. During the postwar period of 1946-66 259.1 million workers have participated in strikes. This is a 3.5-fold increase over twenty years preceding the Second World War. Mass strikes have recently occurred in France, Italy, Britain, Japan and the United States.

Lenin highly valued the strike movement in capitalist countries. "Strikes, therefore, teach the workers to unite; they show them that they can struggle against the capitalists only when they are united; strikes teach the workers to think of the struggle of the whole working class against the whole class of factory owners and against the

arbitrary, police government. This is the reason that socialists call strikes 'a school of war', a school in which the workers learn to make war on their enemies for the liberation of the whole people, of all who labour, from the yoke of government officials and from the yoke of capital."¹

Lenin attached great importance to the national-liberation movement as part of the general anti-imperialist struggle. He stressed that the world revolutionary process would develop successfully only on condition that it organically combined "civil war by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries and a *whole series* of democratic and revolutionary movements, including the national liberation movement, in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed nations."²

The colonial system of imperialism collapsed under the onslaught of the three revolutionary currents of modern time. Over 70 new sovereign states appeared in place of the former colonies and semi-colonies. Whereas 68 per cent of the world population lived in colonial and dependent countries before the 1917 October Revolution, now only about one per cent do so. In fifty years colonial areas have shrunk from 74 per cent of the world's total to some four per cent. There is no doubt that sooner or later the Portuguese, Spanish, American, British and other colonialists will have to vacate the few remaining colonies.

The national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America has sharply narrowed the sphere of direct imperialist domination, it has deprived imperialism of the immense tribute formerly paid by the oppressed peoples. Imperialism has lost most of the man-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 317.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, p. 60.

power resources and territories in Asia, Africa and Latin America which it formerly used for its predatory purposes.

On the other hand, the powerful blows dealt by the national-liberation forces in colonies and semi-colonies in the postwar years have greatly facilitated the struggle for rights of the working class in the metropolitan countries.

The choice by a group of Afro-Asian countries (the United Arab Republic, Burma, Algeria, and others) of the non-capitalist way of development has contributed greatly to the strengthening of the world-wide anti-imperialist unity of the peoples. This means that there have appeared advanced zones within the national-liberation movement, which have carried out profound revolutionary changes and are expanding and strengthening their alliance with world socialism and the international working-class movement. This is the direction in which relations are now developing between the Arab Socialist Union in the United Arab Republic, the Algerian National Liberation Front, the Burmese Socialist Programme Party and the parties of the socialist countries, and the revolutionary movement of the international working class.

Though fighters against imperialism have made considerable progress in recent years in bringing together the main currents of the world revolutionary movement, they still face considerable difficulties. One of the basic strategic goals of imperialism is to subvert, or at least weaken the link between the national-liberation movement and world socialism. The imperialists seek to isolate the national-liberation movement from the influence of the socialist states and the working class of the advanced capitalist countries, to deprive the newly liberated nations of the immense advantages offered by the new situation in the world.

This policy is understandable as far as the imperialists are concerned. Yet certain people who call themselves Marxists have recently been acting in much the same way. As distinct from what Lenin taught on the interaction of the main currents of the world revolutionary movement, a theory has been concocted in Peking to the effect that there is racial, or national "exclusiveness" of liberation revolutions which are claimed to have become the "key zone of revolution," the "chief arena of struggle against imperialism," capable of "surrounding the world town," i.e. imperialism, single-handed and ending its domination.

The anti-Leninist nature of counterposing the national-liberation movement to the world revolutionary movement is patently clear. In fact the Maoists have taken upon themselves one of the basic tasks of imperialist reaction, that of weakening and destroying the international unity of action of the national-liberation forces with world socialism and the international proletarian movement.

Yet the entire history of the anti-colonial revolutions proves that the national and international tasks of the liberation struggle are inseparable. This indivisible interconnection is a pledge of success for the world revolutionary process as a whole.

The cohesion of the three currents of the world revolutionary movement by no means demands absolute identity of views on all questions of international development. The dogmatic approach, on which the Mao Tse-tung group emphatically insists, has nothing in common with Lenin's theory of revolution. Lenin repeatedly stressed that as long as there remained national and state differences between countries and nations, these differences should be taken into account in promoting the unity of the world rev-

olutionary movement. In view of this Lenin saw a task of vital importance for the revolutionaries "to seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle *a single* international task..."¹

Lenin urged all revolutionaries to spare no effort to weld together and strengthen the world anti-imperialist front. This bequest of Lenin acquires special significance in our day in the face of imperialist attempts to launch an all-round counter-offensive against the developing nations. The world revolutionary movement as never before needs all three currents of the world revolutionary movement to merge in the anti-imperialist battle.

¹ V. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

LENIN'S THEORY ON THE MARXIST WORKING-CLASS PARTY AND ITS ROLE IN THE ANTI-COLONIAL STRUGGLE

"The chief thing in the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat," said Lenin. Marxism established that the working class, by virtue of its position, is a social force capable of transforming human society along socialist lines. The growth of large-scale industry, the basis of material and technological progress, brings about a rapid increase in the numbers and proportion of workers in the world's population and enhances their role in social life. It is the working class that is interested in ending private ownership of the means of production, which retards the development of the productive forces, and in replacing it with public ownership which alone can ensure further progress.

The working class, as historical experience has shown, is the most revolutionary class of our epoch not only because of its economic position but also because of its social awareness arising from workers' living and working conditions which engender a spirit of collectivism, high organisation, discipline, cohesion, mutual assistance and support and a thirst for knowledge.

The community of interests of the working

class and other working people, everyone concerned with mankind's advancement give special strength to the working class. When the capitalist monopolies become omnipotent the imperialists bring unbearable pressure on very wide sections of society, and all those who oppose imperialism thus become objective allies of the proletariat, irrespective of their subjective attitude to the ultimate aims of the workers' socialist movement. The common interests of the struggle against the imperialist monopolies, for national independence, democracy and peace create a firm basis for unity of action by the working class and other anti-imperialist forces. Class-conscious workers, for their part, realise that they can liberate themselves only by creating a society free from any exploitation and oppression. Lenin wrote about the working class: "As the only consistently revolutionary class of contemporary society, it must be the leader in the struggle of the whole people for a fully democratic revolution, in the struggle of *all* the working and exploited people against the oppressors and exploiters."¹

The exploiting classes use the army, police and courts against the working people fighting for freedom, against social and national oppression. In order to suppress the will of the working people to struggle, the exploiting classes also use the press, radio and the educational system. Do the working people and the toiling peasantry have an effective weapon in the struggle against home and foreign exploiters? The proletariat, said Lenin, has no other weapon in the struggle for power, for a radiant future, except organisation. The proletariat can and inevitably will become an unconquerable force if the ideas of Marxism and a unified, militant and well-organised party

¹ V. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 231-232.

rally the working people around the revolutionary banner of socialism.

Without their own party, said Lenin, the masses are diffused, unorganised and incapable of waging a consistent and organised struggle. And Lenin continued: "It is to enable the mass of a *definite class* to learn to understand its own interests and its position, to learn to conduct its own policy, that there must be an organisation of the advanced elements of the class, immediately and at all costs, even though at first these elements constitute only a tiny fraction of the class."¹

However, it is not enough for the working class to understand the necessity of having their own, independent party. Very important is just what sort of party it shall be. Not every political organisation claiming the leadership of the working class is able to fulfil the role of the party. Lenin said that it was not enough to call oneself the vanguard, "we must act in such a way that *all* the other contingents recognise and are obliged to admit that we are marching in the vanguard."²

Taking account of historical experience Lenin showed that neither conspiratorial groups divorced from the masses nor amorphous organisations that allowed into their ranks members who expressed views and ideas foreign to the working people, can play a leading role in the workers' and liberation movement. Among leaders of the national-liberation movement (in Latin America, for example) there are people who consider the party to be superfluous; in their opinion any guerilla detachment whether it consists of peasants or representatives of other social groups, is capable of becoming a centre which, rather than

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 409.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 5, p. 426.

the party, can bring about the political unity of the anti-imperialist forces. According to Lenin, the working class can fulfil its historic mission only provided it is headed by a strictly class-orientated, and at the same time mass party having deep roots in the working class and the entire working peoples.

Lenin emphasised that a Marxist party means a union of the most socially conscious fighters for the liberation of the working class, of all the working people, for a radical transformation of society. This is a voluntary union and its members are united not because they are obliged to do so, but because it accords with their beliefs and political views. The theoretical foundation of their outlook is Marxism-Leninism and their goal is to build a communist society.

But, after ideological unity has been attained, the problem of organisational unity arises. Experience shows that a struggle can be successful only if it is waged in unity. That is why Marxists attach great importance to organisation.

What are the organisational principles of a working-class Marxist party?

In order to lead a revolutionary struggle successfully, the party must be in the front ranks of the working class and capable of leading the majority of working people. As an advanced unit it consists of the most socially conscious and experienced people. The party must have deep roots among the broad masses. That is why, together with workers, the party draws into its ranks the best representatives of the peasantry and other sections of the population provided they are free from the burden of petty-bourgeois ideas, share the views of the working class and are prepared to endure the hardships of revolutionary struggle in the interests of the working people.

The strength of the party as a conscious vanguard of the working class lies in that it is armed

with advanced revolutionary theory, Marxism-Leninism, which is international. It is only the right-wing and left-wing opportunists or anti-communists who try to represent Leninism as a purely Russian phenomenon which is impossible in Europe or Asia. Experience has long since disproved this. Marxism-Leninism is strong because it reflects the general laws common to all countries and at the same time takes into consideration the specific features of each country, with regard for concrete historical conditions. Marxism-Leninism makes it possible to arrive at a correct assessment of a situation and to channel the revolutionary movement in the required direction. A knowledge of the laws governing social development and the class struggle assists a better understanding of social phenomena and makes it possible to foretell events. And this, in turn, makes it possible for the party to evolve a correct, scientifically based policy and tactics. That is why Lenin emphasised that "there can be no strong socialist party without a revolutionary theory which unites all socialists, from which they draw all their convictions, and which they apply in their methods of struggle and means of action."¹

The communist party cannot fulfil its vanguard role unless it is an organised unit of the working class. The party directs the work of its members in such a way that they all act in a concerted way, jointly and to the same end. That is why it should be an organised force welded together by the unity of will and action and a single party discipline binding on all its members, from the rank-and-file to the leadership.

Pointing out the significance of organisation Lenin said that "the party is the politically con-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 211.

scious, advanced section of the class, it is its vanguard. The strength of that vanguard is ten times, a hundred times, more than a hundred times, greater than its numbers. Is that possible? Can the strength of hundreds be greater than the strength of thousands? It can be, and is, *when the hundreds are organised*. Organisation increases strength tenfold.”¹

The party is built along the lines of democratic centralism so that all its members and cells work together, take the same direction and aspire for the same goal. This means subordination of the minority to the majority, and the lower bodies to the higher, a single party discipline, a single centre at the head of the party, electivity of all party bodies from bottom to top and their responsibility to the party members, and the right of each party member to criticise, at meetings and in the party press, any other member of the party, including the leaders. Democratic centralism makes it possible for the party, as a militant and united organisation, to lean for support on the whole working class, without making any distinctions between languages or nationalities. Democratic centralism allows the party to determine the class aims common to all workers, irrespective of their national peculiarities. Dividing the proletariat according to national traits and posing different problems and aims for the proletariat of various nationalities means aiding nationalism and weakening the front of working-class struggle against the imperialists.

It is very important for the communist party to solve correctly the question of its relations with other organisations of working people. Besides the party, the working class has trade unions. Youth join various youth organisations.

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 406.

And the working people also have organisations like workers' cooperatives, cultural and educational associations, etc. Lenin considered that these organisations play an important role in working-class struggle but only the party is capable of uniting and properly directing this struggle. The party is the highest form of political organisation and is called upon to lead the entire revolutionary movement and all the non-party organisations of the working people.

This leadership is not carried out in a purely formal fashion. The party wins influence in non-party organisations through its members, working in them.

Calls for trade unions and other public organisations to be "neutral" in respect to the party result in splitting the workers' movement into separate units acting in an uncoordinated way. Leading the public organisations of the working class the party gives their activities their main direction which corresponds with the general line of the revolutionary struggle. The party does not force its will on these organisations, nor does it attempt to replace them.

The main strength of the Marxist party of the working class lies in that it is not a party of individuals but represents the broad masses. For Marxist-Leninists the party has never been an organisation that placed itself above the masses; they have always been concerned about strengthening and multiplying their connections with the masses.

At the end of the last century, when a Marxist workers' party was being formed in Russia, certain revolutionary leaders recognised only the economic struggles of the workers and claimed that the non-party masses could act by themselves, without leadership, while the task of the party was only to record various spontaneous events. Lenin waged a determined struggle

against these views. He called on communists to work everywhere with the masses. The party is effective and authoritative when its activity is connected with the life of the working class and the entire working people. It is only under this condition that it can become strong. Lenin emphasised this with special force. He said: "If the minority is unable to lead the masses and establish close links with them, then it is not a party, and is worthless in general, even if it calls itself a party."¹

Lenin taught that the party's strength and invincibility lies in unity and cohesion and in keeping its ranks free from opportunists. Unity of the party means that all its members and organisations follow the same line in ideological, tactical and organisational matters. This signifies that unity is incompatible with having in the party ranks members who either openly come out against Marxist-Leninist principles or agree with them in words, but act contrary to them. Although the communists do follow a flexible policy, they never make concessions to their ideological enemies on questions of principle. The party is an organisation of like-minded people which cannot function, as Lenin emphasised, without unity on basic problems.

Such are the organisational principles of the Marxist party of the working class, developed by Lenin on the basis of principles expounded by Marx and Engels and the historical experience of the working-class struggle the world over. These principles are natural and objective. They are determined by the historical mission of the working class which, according to Lenin, is "the intellectual and moral motive force"² which

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 238.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 71.

physically implements the great process of replacing capitalism with socialism.

The party's organisational principles follow from Marxist-Leninist ideology, the essence of the party as a militant, revolutionary, unified and independent organisation. These principles comprise the basis for the consolidation of the party's ranks and turn it into an organisation capable of guiding the struggle of the working class and the entire working people and leading them to victory. Lenin regarded the party as the main force of the working class, all working people, their main weapon in the struggle against imperialism.

What are then concrete rules and norms of party life?

One of the most important principles of the communist party is that the party is an organised unit of the working class. The opportunists, while paying lip-service to this premise, put into it a content quite different from that of the Marxist-Leninists. Early this century the Russian opportunists advocated an organisation which would have no clear distinctions between party membership and non-party status. They proposed that any intellectual or striker, sympathising with the party, be included in its ranks. West European social-democrats kept the doors of the party open to all. And today the revisionists propose actually to liquidate the party as an organised entity and replace it with an "association of political action," an organisation which would virtually be a political confederation and not a closely-knit, unified political detachment. In the practice of the armed struggle for national liberation in some countries there have been cases where any guerilla fighter was automatically put on the party list.

Lenin treated the question of party membership in a different way. He proceeded from the following: the social nature of an organisation

and its policy depend not only on the leadership of that organisation, its tactics and actions, but also on its membership. That was why Lenin categorically opposed the proposal that every sympathiser could put himself on the list of party members and that party organisations could admit any applicant.

Experience has shown that such practices give rise to many mistakes of both right-wing opportunist and leftist character. Back in 1939 a number of shortcomings was revealed in the Chinese Communist Party as a result of many representatives of the petty bourgeoisie and other non-proletarian sections joining it. "It is quite natural," said a document of those years, "that some of them begin to waver and change for the worse in a critical moment or complex situation."

The party is not a conglomeration of passers-by but a voluntary militant organisation of fighters with identical views and acting in common, who have joined in the party not by compulsion but by a call of heart and political consciousness. The title of communist imposes a high responsibility and gives no privileges. Communists must devote more of their physical and moral powers and knowledge to the common cause than others and work and fight for the interests of the working people better than others. Communists have no special rights, but it is their duty to be always where things are most difficult. Therefore party organisations cannot lower their requirements of those wishing to join the party. They must devote considerable thought to the admittance of every new person to the party. Lenin once said it was better to leave ten people outside the party than to admit one windbag.

Democratic centralism is the basic organisational principle of the proletarian party. The Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class do not look upon centralism and democracy in isola-

tion from each other. But the opportunists separate democracy from centralism and turn the party into a discussion club, into an amorphous organisation incapable of concerted action, or into a bureaucratic, sectarian group whose members, instead of being active political fighters, become obedient tools. Lenin sharply criticised democracy being opposed to centralism. He emphasised that centralism presupposes an increase in the activity and initiative of communists and party organisations and extensive exchanges of opinion in working out policy and posing new tasks. Lenin wrote that an active political party cannot function without the masses expressing their opinion on the most important questions. The party combines centralism with democracy, discipline with the activity of its members, and the right of communists to discuss and settle all questions with the duty to implement party decisions.

The Marxist-Leninist party is democratic because from a multitude of ideas and approaches to the solution of questions suggested by its members it selects the soundest and most businesslike. On the basis of these the party formulates conclusions and decisions which all its members adopt as their own. There is sometimes heated discussion before a common view is reached. The main point is that this discussion should be waged on the basis of principle and that the opinions expressed should be constructive and prompted by concern for strengthening the party, the improvement of its political line and tactics.

After a majority has adopted a decision each party member must abide by it and do everything necessary to ensure its implementation. This is an imperative condition of party discipline.

Communists should remember Lenin's instruction that while allowing freedom of expression during discussion, "we are not obliged to go hand

in hand with active preachers of views that are repudiated by the majority of the Party.”¹

One cannot recognise centralism and reject democracy and vice versa. Democracy which rejects centralism leads to organisational slackness, breaches of discipline and factionalism. At the same time, exaggerated centralism and lack of democracy inevitably lead to the end of joint discussion and collective leadership, and to the mere issuing of instructions from above.

The essence and effectiveness of the norms and principles of party life are fully revealed when they are consistently implemented and organically combined. Development of inner-party democracy and the constant improvement of forms of inner-party work stimulate the initiative and activity of party members. Collective leadership and links with the rank-and-file are a guarantee against the adoption of wrong decisions and ensure correctness of the political line and the success of the practical activity of party organisations. Criticism and self-criticism are a sure means for the party to keep itself on the right lines and a guarantee against practical mistakes. The Leninist norms of party life and principles of party leadership unite the party's ranks and improve their organisation and efficiency.

Just as Marxism-Leninism is of international significance Lenin's norms of party life and organisational principles for the party structure are not local but universal, reflecting the most important general laws of the development of the Marxist-Leninist parties. As the Statement of the 1960 Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties said, "Marxist-Leninist parties regard it as an inviolable law of their activity steadfastly to observe the Leninist standards of party life in keeping with the principle of democ-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 409.

ratic centralism; they consider that they must cherish party unity like the apple of their eye, strictly adhere to the principle of party democracy and collective leadership, for they attach, in keeping with the organisational principles of Leninism, great importance to the role of the leading party bodies in the life of the party, work indefatigably for the strengthening of their bonds with the party membership and with the broad masses of the working people, must not allow the personality cult, which shackles creative thought and initiative of communists, must vigorously promote the activity of communists, and encourage criticism and self-criticism in their ranks."

Practical experience has shown that wherever the Leninist norms of party life are violated an anti-Leninist, anti-Marxist political line is pursued. A case in point is the Chinese Communist Party.

The communist parties are independent in defining their policy and tactics, and in their actions. But they do not see their independence as being in opposition to the solidarity of the fraternal parties and always remember their obligation to adhere to joint decisions. Without coordinating their actions and jointly implementing decisions adopted, the communist movement would lose the positions it has gained.



LENIN ON THE ALLIANCE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND THE PEASANTRY, ON THE IDEOLOGY AND POLICY OF THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE

The social structures of colonies and countries recently liberated from foreign domination have certain specific features deriving from survivals of the colonialist past. One of them is the predominance of the peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie and various semi-proletarian groups.

These social strata are far from being homogeneous. The upper crust is composed of kulaks, well-to-do artisans and shopkeepers; the poorest section consists of landless peasants and the urban lumpen-proletariat who do odd jobs to eke out a living.

These social categories (sometimes termed "intermediate" or "middle" strata) also exist in advanced capitalist countries; but the proportion is far greater in dependent and developing countries. This is due to the fact that imperialist oppression and its aftereffects retard the industrial development of these countries. Consequently, disintegration of the "intermediate" strata is a rather slow process: the relatively well-to-do upper crust has certain (though limited) possibilities of becoming capitalist proprietors, whereas the impoverished strata rarely rise to the level

of wage workers (either in industry or agriculture).

In feudal and semi-feudal and colonial conditions the numerous intermediate strata and the working class constitute the most oppressed part of the population.

According to Lenin, the agrarian problem, the problem of freeing the peasantry from feudal exploitation and all its vestiges, constitutes the essence of any bourgeois-democratic revolution; in a national-liberation revolution, for example, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal problems are closely intertwined and solved simultaneously. If bourgeois-democratic transformations are effected in a consistent, radical way the peasants stand a good chance of becoming the owners of the land they till; both in town and country provisions are made for the development of private enterprise. But, as Lenin pointed out in his works, the development of capitalism sharply accelerates the process of stratification of the peasantry and the petty urban bourgeoisie; well-off peasants and sometimes landlords become capitalist farmers who employ hired hands and farm techniques; well-to-do artisans and shopkeepers sometimes manage to become factory owners and prosperous merchants. Most of the peasants and petty artisans are ruined and join the mass of urban and rural proletariat. Discontented with the rule of the big bourgeoisie, the peasants and the petty-bourgeois elements are given to anti-capitalist sentiments, to socialist (usually Utopian) dreams. The working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties regard the peasantry and the "intermediate" strata as their main potential ally both in the struggle for national independence, against feudal survivals and, at a later stage, in the struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie.

Under capitalism the peasantry is incapable

of freeing itself from exploitation, poverty and ruin unaided. It can do so only in the event that proletarian revolution triumphs. The founders of scientific communism pointed out that the peasant could be delivered from misery only with the downfall of capital; only an anti-capitalist proletarian government could end his economic plight and social degradation. Marx and Engels' ideas on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry were developed and put into effect by V. I. Lenin and the communist party he headed.

In spite of the relatively rapid development of industry, tsarist Russia, on the threshold of the 20th century, continued to remain an agrarian country. The peasants in Russia, who comprised the biggest class, were literally stifled from lack of land, from poverty. Thirty thousand landlord families had as much land as ten and a half million peasant holdings. The exploitation of peasant labour intensified with the development of capitalism in Russia. It is only natural that such miserable conditions compelled the peasants to rise up against the existing order. In this way, life itself was transforming the peasantry into an ally of the working class that was fighting tsarism.

However it was a very difficult task to win the peasantry over to the side of the revolution. It was particularly difficult since the peasantry, like other non-proletarian masses involved in small-scale commodity production, occupies an intermediate place between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The thing in common between the peasantry and the proletariat is that both are exploited; as private property holders, the peasants are allied with the bourgeoisie.

Because of their economic inhomogeneity the non-proletarian masses are stratified in the course

of capitalist development. As has been noted, the majority become utterly impoverished and join the ranks of the proletariat, while the minority become rich and merge with the bourgeoisie.

Proceeding from this dual nature of the peasantry, Lenin came to the conclusion that at different stages of the revolution the working class would have different strata of the peasantry as its allies. During the bourgeois-democratic revolution, Lenin pointed out, all peasants are allied with the proletariat. The peasants seek to acquire national independence, to have a democratic government and to uproot the vestiges of feudalism and serfdom. At the stage of the socialist revolution, the poor peasantry becomes the ally of the proletariat. Victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie, including the exploiting elements in the countryside, is in the poor peasants' interests.

Lenin stressed that even though the peasantry is a natural ally of the working class, it is necessary to struggle hard to win the peasantry over to the side of the working class, to disclose its great revolutionary potentialities. It is precisely in this direction that the working class should display its guiding role with respect to the peasantry. The struggle for the peasantry, Lenin said, is all-important because victory of the revolution and the construction of socialism are impossible without an alliance of the working class and the peasantry, with the proletariat playing the guiding role.

What did Lenin and the party do to win the peasantry to the side of the working class in preparation for the socialist revolution? The agrarian programme of the communist party became a powerful ideological weapon in the hands of the working class in the struggle for the peasant masses. The main demand in this programme was the confiscation of the landlords' land

and turning it over to those who till it. Such a demand reflected the vital interests of the Russian peasantry.

But it is not enough to work out a correct programme. It was necessary to explain it to the peasants. In the prevailing conditions Lenin and the communists made extensive use of working in the army for propaganda purposes and for organising the peasant masses in the pre-revolutionary years. That was the time of the First World War. Of the 15,000,000 Russian soldiers, nearly 13,000,000 were peasants, the remainder being workers and intellectuals. Consequently, there were excellent opportunities in the army for the working class and its party to actively influence the peasantry.

Concentrating on work among the soldiers, the communists headed by Lenin were solving two problems: they were winning the armed masses over to the side of the working class and, by winning the soldiers over to the side of the revolution, the working class found advocates of its ideology amongst the peasantry.

In the industrial cities of Russia where military garrisons were stationed, organisations were set up to carry on communist propaganda among the soldiers. They established soldiers' clubs where they gave reports, lectures, held talks, meetings and demonstrations in which soldiers joined in with the workers. Thousands of soldiers on leave, who had left cities for villages, were, in effect, propagandisers of revolutionary ideas among the peasant masses. It was from the soldiers that the peasants learnt of the programme advanced by the communist party, of the struggle waged by the working class, of the objectives pursued in this struggle, of the role the peasantry was destined to play in it.

The anti-war activities of the communists served in a large measure, to enhance the influen-

ce of the working class among the peasantry. The peasants were attracted by the fact that the working class and the communist party demanded peace. After all, the peasants bore the brunt of the war, started by capitalists. The demand of the communists to stop the war found lively response among the peasantry. The peasants began to realise it was impossible to secure peace as long as the capitalists were in power.

They began to understand they could only fight capitalists in alliance with the working class.

Extensive party propaganda in the countryside bore fruit. When the urban proletariat rose in the Socialist Revolution of October 1917, peasant uprisings in support of the revolution swept the whole of Russia. The struggle of the proletariat merged with mass action by the peasantry. But this alliance did not manifest itself solely in peasant uprisings that took place simultaneously with working-class action in towns and cities; this alliance was apparent, above all, in the fact that the peasant uprisings were aided and often guided by the workers. The peasant war, by itself, without being tied in with the action of the factory workers, would have been doomed to failure.

The next day after the revolutionary uprising in the capital of Russia when the bourgeois government was overthrown, the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies passed the Decree on Land which was drawn up by Lenin. The Decree said in part: "... landed proprietorship is abolished forthwith without any compensation."¹ In accordance with the Decree, the peasants received over 150,000,000 hectares (3,750,000,000 acres) of land, free of charge. They were exem-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 258.

pted from paying annual rent and expenditures for buying land amounting to a total of 700,000,000 gold roubles; they were also freed from paying the land bank a debt of 1.3 thousand million roubles. Evaluating the practical results of the October Revolution for the peasant masses, Lenin wrote: "In this peasant country it was the peasantry as a whole who were the first to gain, who gained most, and gained immediately from the dictatorship of the proletariat... Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the peasant *for the first time* has been working for himself and *feeding better than the city dweller*. For the first time the peasant has seen real freedom—freedom to eat his bread, freedom from starvation." ¹

In Russia the dictatorship of the proletariat, which Lenin spoke of, took the form of a Republic of Soviets: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these strata, an alliance against capital, an alliance whose aim is the complete overthrow of capital, complete suppression of the resistance offered by the bourgeoisie as well as of attempts at restoration on its part, an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of socialism." ²

Guided by the Communist party the working class of Russia was able to unite the different progressive movements and direct them towards a single goal—to overthrow the power of capital. The party merged into a single revolutionary current—the popular movement for peace, the

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 112.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 381.

peasants' struggle for land, the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples of tsarist Russia against national oppression and the struggle of the proletariat for socialism.

Attaching paramount importance to the experience of the Bolsheviks in forming an alliance of the workers and the peasantry, Lenin tried to make this experience accessible to the working class in all countries. As the history of the anti-imperialist struggle has shown, this experience has become the guiding factor for true fighters for national and social emancipation of oppressed peoples. The International Scientific Conference "The Great October Socialist Revolution and the National-Liberation Movement of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America" held in the USSR in 1967, was addressed by Dang Kwang Minh, head of the permanent mission of the South Vietnam National-Liberation Front in the Soviet Union. Speaking on applying the experience of the Russian communists to the national-liberation revolution in South Vietnam, Dang Kwang Minh stressed that the peasant question is the main issue of the democratic revolution, that the national question in the colonies is essentially a peasant question. "Studying Russian experience," Dang Kwang Minh said, "we, in South Vietnam, combine the guidance of the struggle waged by the urban population with the implementation of an agrarian policy according to the principle: 'Land for those who work it!'"

Thus, in our days Lenin's teaching about the alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian masses and, first and foremost, with the peasants is of vital practical importance for the workers' and the communist parties of the world. Any attempts to distort it, or to interpret it in a vulgar form, can lead to negative results. This is evident from the groundless theoretical "discoveries" of the Peking leadership. On nu-

merous occasions we have witnessed Peking's attempts to implant Mao's "thought" in place of Marxist-Leninist teaching on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

Mao Tse-tung's mistrust in the proletariat and its ability to lead the revolutionary struggle is well known. This mistrust was reflected in the dissolution of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions and the persecution of local communist party organisations during the so-called cultural revolution. These actions, effected on Mao's orders, undermine the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, the guiding role of the proletariat. It would be naive to think that Mao's petty-bourgeois outlook is doing the peasantry a good turn. His attempts to herd all peasants into army barracks, to deprive them of any hope of ever improving their living standards, discredit the very ideas of socialism.

Likewise, it is evident that Mao's call to envelop the cities with the countryside, to develop armed guerilla struggle and to carry through "agrarian revolution" in countries where conditions for this had not matured, have nothing in common with the scientific approach to the general laws of class struggle waged by the working people.

Practice shows that nowadays for those countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America where the peasantry constitutes the bulk of the population, Lenin's teaching about the alliance of the working class and the peasantry has acquired tremendous significance.

Insofar as immediate historical prospects are concerned, this alliance is the guarantee of success in the struggle waged by the urban and rural working people for national and social emancipation.

It is necessary, however, always to bear in mind the dual social and political status of the

peasantry, the petty-urban bourgeoisie and semi-proletarian elements.

The economic interests of these strata, described above, determine the specific features of their social consciousness and their political attitudes.

In colonies and dependent countries organisations composed of and led by petty-bourgeois elements usually take a revolutionary-nationalist position. They often join forces with the workers' Marxist-Leninist parties and are capable of adopting radical political programmes, including socialist. The most politically mature representatives of the petty-bourgeois radical democrats gravitate towards Marxism-Leninism; many of them at a certain stage join the ranks of the communist movement.

But on the whole the petty-bourgeois national-revolutionary organisations are more often than not given to vacillation in the struggle; they show contempt for a sober scientific analysis of a concrete situation and tend to indulge in thoughtless anarchical tactics, putschism and terrorist methods of struggle; they readily succumb to propaganda advocating national, religious and racial exclusiveness (which plunges some of them into the ranks of the fascist movement). "The instability of such revolutionism," Lenin said, "its barrenness, and its tendency to turn rapidly into submission, apathy, phantasms, and even a frenzied infatuation with one bourgeois fad or another—all this is common knowledge."¹

As Lenin stressed, petty-bourgeois vacillations take various forms depending on the historical situation. He called these vacillations "petty-bourgeois revolutionism" and defined it as "menacing, blustering and boastful in words, but

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 32.

a mere bubble of disunity, disruption and brainlessness in deeds.”¹ Lenin warned against the danger of these petty-bourgeois vices penetrating the midst of the working class, the ranks of the proletarian party.

As mentioned above, the Great October Socialist Revolution sparked off the process whereby the theory of Marxism-Leninism began to be adopted not only by the working movement of advanced countries but also by the peasant and national-liberation movements. This helped draw the national-liberation struggles of oppressed nations and the socialist movement of the world proletariat closer together. But this complicated process has certain specific features in countries with predominantly peasant populations, in colonies and dependent territories. Insufficiently mature leaders of some of the national-liberation movements, peasants and petty-bourgeois elements by origin, often looked upon Marxism-Leninism as a totality of slogans and theses, and not as an integrated system of views.

People raised in conditions of a subsistence economy, oppressed by feudalism and foreign capital, sometimes find it difficult to appreciate the ideas of socialist democracy, of proletarian internationalism in all their profoundness and dialectics. Lenin pointed out that the very socio-economic conditions that breed a petty owner, give a particular tenacity to one of the “deepest of petty-bourgeois prejudices, i.e., to national egoism and national narrow-mindedness.”²

Lenin and the party he created always regarded the struggle against the penetration of pernicious petty-bourgeois influences into the ranks of the proletarian fighters as their foremost duty. Lenin wrote: “When it came into

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 21.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 150.

being in 1903, Bolshevism took over the tradition of a ruthless struggle against petty-bourgeois, semi-anarchist (or dilettante-anarchist) revolutionism.”¹

The experience of many workers’ parties shows that educating the non-proletarian masses in the spirit of true Marxism-Leninism is an exceptionally complicated task which can be successfully undertaken only by an ideologically steeled, politically experienced vanguard of the working class.

The Communist Party of China is a graphic example of what happens when petty-bourgeois tendencies are given free rein. For a party like the CPC with a predominantly peasant membership, the activities of its proletarian core would be of a decisive importance enabling the party to conduct a consistently proletarian policy, to overcome the petty-bourgeois element that confronts it. But the Mao Tse-tung group that rose to power in the early 1930s was captivated by petty-bourgeois ideology with all its implications such as nationalism, arbitrary and militaristic methods of leadership, totally alien to Marxism-Leninism. Therefore it did not halt the petty-bourgeois element. Instead, it allowed it to take hold in the party, paralysing the influence of the proletarian elements in the CPC.

In the early 1940s, under the guise of “rectification of the style of work,” the CPC was being oriented by its leaders towards a policy of Sinoisation of Marxism, proclaimed by Mao Tse-tung back in 1938 and actually denying the internationalist nature of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

The promotion and encouragement of the Mao Tse-tung personality cult (which originated in the late 1930s and was officially formalised by

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 33.

the 7th Congress of the CPC, 1945, as party policy), could be safely regarded as a sign of petty-bourgeois degeneration among the party leadership. In the following twenty years the Mao personality cult developed to the extent of eventually becoming a tragedy for the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people.

Current events in China, the so-called great proletarian cultural revolution now going on in the country, the deification of Mao Tse-tung, praise of his adventurist anti-Marxist ideas give one cause to examine the danger and the harmful consequences of the personality cult in a more detailed way.

As distinct from bourgeois ideology, Marxism-Leninism holds that it is the people who are the creators of history, the working masses who create the material and spiritual values for society. However, Marxism-Leninism does not deny the role of certain individuals in history. Such individuals include scientists, writers, artists, whose creative labour enables science and culture to advance. Equally important is the role of public and political personalities who lead the masses, the progressive classes and political parties. No class, especially the working class, can lead society unless it is organised and, consequently, has leaders that determine its policies and how to implement them.

Marxism-Leninism recognises the role of outstanding personalities but it does not consider it as absolute; it regards the activities of leaders as closely tied in with social relations and not apart from them.

An outstanding historical personality can advance a progressive cause only if the person in question takes cognizance of the objective laws governing the development of society.

Basing himself on these laws, a leader uses his knowledge and experience to foresee immi-

ent social changes, to help bring about these changes. Georgi Plekhanov, an outstanding Russian Marxist of the latter half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, said that a truly prominent leader is he who is above his compatriots in that he is the first to grasp the essence of new, emerging social relations.

Lenin repeatedly stressed that not a single class ever gained supremacy without bringing into the limelight its foremost representatives, capable of organising the movement. The working class is particularly in need of experienced leaders because it is destined to carry through fundamental transformations in society.

Thus, Marxism-Leninism by no means denies the role of influential leaders of the working class. But recognition of the influence and authority of a leader does not mean playing up his personality out of all proportion and that all merits of the movement should be ascribed to a leader, however outstanding. We are well aware of the tremendous influence and popularity of the great proletarian leaders—Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and Vladimir Lenin.

But they waged a resolute struggle against the personality cult, against attempts to over-stress their merits. In a letter to one of his revolutionary friends Karl Marx wrote: "Because of aversion to any personality cult, I have never permitted the numerous expressions of appreciation from various countries, with which I was pestered during the existence of the International, to reach the realm of publicity, and have never answered them, except occasionally by a rebuke."¹

When Lenin learned that some of his party comrades had decided to set up a museum dedi-

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels. *Sel. Correspondence*, Progress Publishers, M., p. 310.

cated to his life and work he resolutely protested. Lenin never allowed his personality to be extolled although he enjoyed unlimited authority and was loved by millions of working people. Lenin's colossal influence never developed into a personality cult. Lenin consistently put into practice the standards of party life and party leadership which ensured and continue to ensure collective discussion on all fundamental issues of the policy pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism opposed the personality cult because it is inimical to proletarian ideology and the materialistic conception of history. The personality cult minimises the role of the working people, the nation, the party.

Marxist-Leninist theory stresses the decisive role of the masses in history and explains why it is so. Lenin held that "the minds of tens of millions of those who are doing things create something infinitely loftier than the greatest genius can foresee."¹

The realisation that it is the people, the masses who are the creators of history is important not only for the leaders but also for the masses themselves. It inspires them to wage the liberation struggle, gives them confidence in their strength. Glorification of a personality, praising an individual's merits beyond all measure are detrimental to the correct ideological orientation of the masses. The personality cult fosters passivity in the masses, it hampers the active involvement of the masses in the revolutionary struggle, in the construction of a new life.

Moreover, the personality cult undermines the profound democratism inherent in the socialist movement. The personality cult generates the conditions whereby the masses are deprived

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 474.

of the possibility of participating in the revolutionary process and their leaders can no longer learn from the masses by generalising their experience.

Under the personality cult leaders have extreme powers. Personal, arbitrary decisions are made instead of adopting collectively thought-out decisions, taking into account the experience of the masses. All too often they prove erroneous and greatly harmful for the socialist movement as a whole. The personality cult often gives rise to certain harmful manifestations that have nothing to do with the nature of socialism and stem from negative personal attributes of the leader.

The personality cult has nothing in common with socialism whose strength is derived from the multi-million masses of working people.

In keeping with the decisions adopted at the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the decisions of communist and workers' parties of other countries, all manifestations of the personality cult are resolutely condemned.

The personality cult flowers in China. It is due to the fact that petty-bourgeois ideology was not opposed by the CPC leaders; just the reverse: they inculcated it.

In China where the cult of emperor (father of the Celestial Empire) held sway for centuries, democratic traditions did not take root.

Petty-bourgeois infiltration of the party helped create an atmosphere of glorification of heroes. As far back as 1939 Liu Shao-chi pointed out in lectures given at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Yenan that the Communist Party of China included many people who knew nothing about Marxism-Leninism and indulged in Marxist-Leninist terminology. They looked upon themselves as "Chinese Marxes" or "Chinese Lenins."

“Moreover,” said Liu Shao-chi, “they made bold to demand that the party members accord them the respect given to Marx and Lenin, that they be supported as leaders, that they be loved and obeyed. They could even appoint themselves leaders without waiting to be nominated, they wormed their way into high posts, they bossed the party as though it were their docile family, tried to teach the party while themselves condemned everything; they arbitrarily reprimanded party members, punished them and did as they pleased with them.” Liu Shao-chi did not name anyone, saying this was a thing of the past. As to whether anyone could be sure such elements would not re-appear in the party ranks, he felt they could not be positive about it.

Today the Mao personality cult has assumed monstrous proportions. It is organically tied in with nationalism, with the petty-bourgeois adventurism of the Mao anti-Marxist group; it greatly harms the interests of the working class and the Chinese people as a whole; it discredits the banner of Marxism and objectively plays into the hands of imperialism—the worst enemy of the working people.

LENINIST TACTICS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY NATIONAL-LIBERATION STRUGGLE

Throughout the history of human society long periods of gradual, evolutionary developments have been followed by violent revolutionary outbursts bringing about profound changes in the people's mode of life. According to Marxist-Leninist theory, revolutions are not invoked at somebody's will but result from the sharpening of socio-economic contradictions. Social revolution succeeds in a country only when that country is ripe for it, that is, only when certain historical conditions obtain in that country. The sum total of the conditions necessary for the success of the revolution is called by Lenin the revolutionary situation.

Characterising the revolutionary situation he wrote:

"We shall certainly not be mistaken if we indicate the following three major symptoms: 1) when it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule without any change; when there is a crisis, in one form or another, among the 'upper classes,' a crisis in the policy of the ruling class, leading to a fissure through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes burst forth. For a revolution to take place, it is usually insufficient for the 'lower classes not to want' to live in the old way; it

is also necessary that 'the upper classes should be unable' to live in the old way; 2) when the suffering and want of the oppressed classes have grown more acute than usual; 3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who uncomplainingly allow themselves to be robbed in 'peace time,' but, in turbulent times, are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis and by the 'upper classes' themselves into independent historical action.

"Without these objective changes, which are independent of the will, not only of individual groups and parties but even of individual classes, a revolution, as a general rule, is impossible. The totality of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation."¹

Thus, one of the symptoms of the revolutionary situation is the lowering of the working people's living standards, for here the contradictions of imperialism are particularly sharp. The history of the revolution in Russia and several other countries has shown that impoverishment of the working masses is an important factor in the development of the revolutionary situation. But impoverishment alone does not necessarily lead to the revolutionary situation. Many capitalist countries were shaken by the economic crisis on the eve of World War II, which sharply lowered the living standards of the working people in some of these countries. However, no revolutionary situation arose in those countries owing to the absence of a number of other conditions, besides pauperisation of the masses, necessary for the rise of the revolutionary situation.

In the present epoch, the revolutionary situation may shape up in the advanced capitalist

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 21, p. 214.

countries in conditions other than extreme poverty and misery of the popular masses. But of course the economic gap between the exploiters and the exploited remains and is widening. Consequently, it is the heightening of economic inequality rather than impoverishment of the masses as such that may lead to a revolutionary situation in capitalist society.

We believe it is necessary to clarify this question in view of the attempts by the Mao group to vulgarise Marxist theory. The Peking leaders assert that the revolutionary situation is conceivable only in countries where the working people are reduced to extreme poverty. According to Mao, the poorer are the working people and the more ruthless are their exploiters, the better chance there is for rise of the revolutionary situation.

Proceeding from this fallacious premise, the Peking leaders reach the equally fallacious conclusion that the working class in the advanced capitalist countries is contented after their economic condition has been improved to a certain extent and thus rejects revolutionary struggle. But present-day developments do not support this view. In the first ranks of the fighters against monopolies we see politically mature workers of various wage levels.

The situation in a number of African, Asian and Latin American countries, where poverty and hunger inherited from the century-old colonial rule have not yet been overcome, also disproves the Maoist view according to which revolution must have flared up in every one of them.

As Lenin pointed out: "Oppression alone, no matter how great, does not always give rise to a revolutionary situation in a country. In most cases it is not enough for revolution that *the lower classes should not want to live in the old*

way. It is also necessary that the upper *classes should be unable* to rule and govern in the old way.”¹

By carefully analysing Lenin's proposition we have the following picture of the revolutionary situation. As a result of increasing poverty or economic inequality, as well as other manifestations of national and class contradictions, discontent and anger begin to rise among the working masses. The masses start active political struggle against the existing order. Their anger results in such revolutionary actions as strikes and demonstrations. The foundations of the exploiter society begin to rock under the impact of mass actions. The ruling classes try to find a way out of the situation which is perilous for them. Part of the upper crust is inclined to make some concessions to the masses in the hope of preventing revolution. The ruling classes are no longer united among themselves. Crisis of power develops.

The revolutionary situation only obtains with the existence of certain factors—the growth of revolutionary sentiments among the masses and crisis of power among the ruling classes. The appearance of these factors clearly depends on the specific political and socio-economic situation in the country: the presence and the nature of foreign oppression, the degree of exploitation of the working people, the strength and organisational level of the revolutionary class and its cohesion with other classes—its potential allies, the condition of the entire state apparatus and the degree of disintegration of the ruling class.

Can any events hasten the maturing of the revolutionary situation? This is what Lenin wrote: “where the objective conditions of a profound political crisis exist, the tiniest conflicts

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 221-22.

seemingly remote from the real breeding ground of revolution, can be of the most serious importance as the reason, as the last straw, as a turning point in public feeling.”¹

The development of the revolutionary situation in the past was in the main caused by extreme circumstances—sharp economic crises, wholesale repressions against the working people and wars. As Lenin pointed out, wars expose and aggravate the contradictions of the capitalist system, immeasurably increasing the people’s misery and thereby precipitating the revolutionary situation. But, at the same time war puts certain hurdles in the way of revolution. The point is that war destroys productive forces and people who could have participated in the revolution and brought it to a victorious end. War also leads to the militarisation of the country, which inevitably strengthens the position of extreme reaction.

At present, when a powerful community of socialist countries exists capable of preventing war, it is the world situation rather than war that provides favourable conditions for the appearance of the political prerequisites of revolution. True Marxist-Leninists support revolutionary wars, but resolutely oppose aggressive imperialist wars. Imperialist wars, especially nuclear warfare, may lay waste enormous territories, destroy hundreds of millions of human lives and imperil the existence of mankind.

It follows from what is said above that at the present time attempts to deprive the working people of their democratic gains and national independence, the threat of reactionary coups and the resurgence of fascism, as well as the menace to peace and sovereignty must be regarded as the major causes for the rise of the

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 276.

revolutionary situation. The working people, whose political consciousness has grown immensely in our days, can undertake determined revolutionary action to forestall dangerous moves planned by the reactionaries.

The rise of the revolutionary situation, however, does not mean that the revolution is bound to succeed. The revolutionary situation only creates the objective prerequisites for the revolution. But again, these prerequisites alone do not settle the question. History knows of many cases where a revolutionary situation did not lead to a revolution. As Lenin repeatedly stressed, every revolutionary situation does not give rise to a revolution. For the revolution to succeed, there must be, besides the indispensable objective conditions, conscious revolutionary activities on the part of the vanguard class, and the masses must be able to take powerful revolutionary actions so that they could overcome the resistance of the exploiters who, as Lenin pointed out, will never cede power unless they are forced to do so. The realisation by the working masses of the necessity to overthrow the exploiting classes and their readiness to make sacrifices in order to achieve this were considered by Lenin as a subjective factor.

In order to organise and guide the working people's effort, an experienced Marxist-Leninist working-class party must be able to recognise the moment of the rise of the revolutionary situation. At this moment the party must display effective leadership, uniting and turning spontaneous mass actions into conscious struggle for the revolution.

The party must be able to analyse the political situation and see what classes are involved in the struggle and to what extent. The party must also be able to foresee the kind of actions these classes will take at various turns of the

revolution. Since the political situation may change quickly as the revolutionary situation develops, the party must possess the skill to properly assess the situation at each particular stage and determine the moment when there is the utmost vacillation and confusion among the ruling circles and when the people's anger reaches a climax. This is the moment when the party must take decisive actions.

Lenin never considered the objective conditions of the revolution, that is, the revolutionary situation, in isolation from the subjective conditions ensuring the transition of the revolutionary situation to its highest phase, which Lenin called the nation-wide crisis. In other words, the nation-wide crisis develops only when the masses have gained enough political experience to realise that there is no other way out but revolution.

In the present-day conditions the role of the subjective factor is becoming more and more important. The question as to whether the conditions which are currently developing and are favourable for the revolution will be correctly used increasingly depends on the tactical flexibility of the working-class party and its ability to choose the proper forms of struggle on the basis of the concrete historical and national conditions.

This does not mean, however, that the party will remain passive and merely wait for the fruit to ripen and fall at its feet. By pursuing a correct policy and working among the masses, the party can and should speed up the process leading to the creation of the necessary conditions for a successful revolution. To achieve this, the party must guide the mass movement, helping the masses to draw the proper lessons from victories and defeats, and explain to them why slogans and forms of struggle must be changed

when situation changes. The party must expose social contradictions and the mechanism of exploitation and thus prepare the masses for action. The party must also properly combine the fight for the satisfaction of the working people's immediate needs with the struggle for the ultimate goal.

An analysis of the situation in economically backward countries where there is imperialist domination and where the working people are terrorised by the ruling classes, shows that armed struggle of the revolutionary classes often takes place prior to the nation-wide crisis. In such cases armed struggle, provided it has the people's support, may accelerate the development of the revolutionary situation. But it should be remembered that armed revolutionary action will bring the revolution closer only if the symptoms of the revolutionary situation have already appeared in the country's political life and revolutionary aspirations have become widespread among the masses. If these basic symptoms of the ripeness of the revolutionary situation are absent and the masses are not ready to support the armed struggle, then there can be no guarantee of the success of the struggle. To hope for success in such a situation would be adventurism. The experience of some Latin American countries and Indonesia shows that armed struggle in such conditions is doomed to failure and would only hamper the development of the revolution.

All questions relating to the emergence and development of the objective and subjective conditions for the revolution are considered by the parties in the context of the specific conditions existing in their countries. There can be no zonal or continental revolutions. The question of revolution is solved separately by each country on the basis of the concrete conditions existing

in that country. This is what Lenin taught us; and this has been proved by the history of the international communist movement.

According to Marxism-Leninism, success of the revolutionary struggle largely depends on the ability of the revolutionary party to work out and pursue a correct policy and to choose the correct means and methods of struggle. The history of the working class and the national-liberation movement shows, however, that revolutionary parties are not always capable of elaborating a correct policy. Among the errors made in the past is, as Lenin noted, adventurism.

Adventurism in the revolutionary movement means the pursuit of a policy that is not based on the realities in the world, the proper assessment of the balance of class forces in society and consideration of the mood of the masses. Adventurism is thus detrimental to the cause of the revolution; it leads to the defeat of the revolutionary forces.

Often those who wish to take hasty, rash actions hypnotise themselves with ultra-left, ultra-revolutionary slogans. They want to solve all problems quickly and at once, without any preparation, without considering the real situation that exists or the general laws of social development and class struggle. Such hasty moves may well endanger the lives of the rank-and-file party members and lead to unjustifiable sacrifices, doing great harm to the cause of national and social liberation in the long run.

Lenin, therefore, consistently fought against adventurism both in the Russian and the international working-class movement. In many of his works and public addresses, including such well-known pieces as *What is to Be Done* (1902), *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic*

Revolution (1905), and especially *Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder* (1920), Lenin gave a comprehensive analysis of the various adventurist tendencies in the revolutionary movement.

According to Lenin, some of the causes behind the adventurism of some revolutionaries are their immaturity, poor ideological and theoretical background, ignorance of the laws of social development, class struggle and revolution, and inability to make a deep and comprehensive analysis of the complicated processes taking place in society. They formulate their policy on the basis of wishful thinking and one-sided views failing to take into account the existing objective conditions. The communist party, Lenin taught, must proceed from the objective consideration of the sum total of relationships between all the classes of a given society, the level of development of this society and the situation in other countries. In doing this, it must regard all classes and countries not as static forces, but as forces in the process of change.

Another cause behind the adventuristic approach of some revolutionaries, Lenin wrote, is that their tactics of struggle are guided by the revolutionary sentiments of a few individual groups of people instead of being related to the various favourable and unfavourable factors in this struggle. "Certainly, without a revolutionary mood among the masses, and without conditions facilitating the growth of this mood, revolutionary tactics will never develop into action. In Russia, however, lengthy, painful and sanguinary experience has taught us the truth that revolutionary tactics cannot be built on a revolutionary mood alone. Tactics must be based on a sober and strictly objective appraisal of *all* the class forces in a particular state (and of the states that surround it, and of all states the

world over) as well as of the experience of revolutionary movements.”¹

Adventurism in the revolutionary struggle, Lenin pointed out, manifests itself in a tendency to use forms of struggle not yet accepted by the masses. Armed struggle, including individual terrorism, guerilla movement and uprisings is considered the most radical method, the only method applicable in all conditions. Lenin resolutely condemned the subjectivism of such revolutionaries, pointing out that methods which do not have the support of the masses and for which they are not prepared could only do harm to the revolutionary movement.

Lenin stressed that true revolutionaries must not absolutise one or another form of the working people's struggle. They must carefully consider the suitability of the forms at each stage of the struggle, taking into account the scope of the revolutionary movement, the mood of the masses and the actual situation.

Lenin was strongly opposed to the attempts to justify the use of individual terrorism and other forms of armed struggle by citing the necessity of “stirring up” the working class, of “pushing” it into action. Lenin pointed out that it was impossible to “drive” the working class into the struggle. The working class would not respond to revolutionary appeals until it is ready for revolution.

In his fight against adventurism in the working-class and national-liberation movement Lenin exposed its class nature, and its social roots. He showed that the origin of adventurist views and tendencies lay in petty-bourgeois ideology and politics, in petty-bourgeois revolutionary thinking. He wrote: “...the petty proprietor, the small master... who, under capitalism, always

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 63.

suffers oppression and very frequently a most acute and rapid deterioration in his conditions of life, and even ruin, easily goes to revolutionary extremes.”¹ The petty bourgeois, Lenin pointed out, though revolted by the horrors of capitalism, is incapable of waging a protracted and organised fight. He lacks self-control, discipline and perseverance. He would like to do away with the rule of big capital as quickly as possible and thus seizes on the most desperate means of struggle. He supports ultra-left, ultra-revolutionary slogans and trends, thinking that they would lead him to victory. This petty-bourgeois revolutionary thinking influences the working-class and national-liberation movement, engendering all kinds of adventurist ideas and trends.

The party led by Lenin has time and again had to combat adventuristic tendencies in the working-class movement. This struggle was particularly sharp in the first days following the October Revolution.

The October Socialist Revolution took place during World War I when Russia was engaged in military operations against Germany and its allies. In the interests of the socialist revolution, Russia withdrew from the imperialist war and concluded peace with the belligerent powers. However, certain party members, the so-called left communists, were against this. It was disgraceful for a country of proletarian dictatorship, they contended, to conclude peace with imperialist powers. They asserted with impatience that the only correct policy for the Communists was to have Soviet Russia wage a revolutionary war against all imperialists.

Lenin and the majority of the party members resolutely opposed this irresponsible talk by the

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 32.

left communists. At that time Soviet Russia did not even have enough forces to conduct an effective defensive war against the advancing troops of the German empire, the Red Army had not yet come into being. As for the calls by the left communists to carry the "revolutionary war" to Western Europe, such a move would also be impermissible since Leninism rejects in principle any hastening of the revolution from without, any attempts to "export" revolution. Lenin wrote in this connection: "Perhaps the authors believe that the interests of the world revolution require that it should be *given a push*, and that such a push can be given only by war, never by peace... Such a 'theory' would be completely at variance with Marxism, for Marxism has always been opposed to 'pushing' revolutions, which develop with the growing acuteness of the class antagonisms."¹

Firmly denouncing the adventurist assertions that revolution was carried forward "by the Red Armymen's bayonets," Lenin showed the danger of the anti-Marxist approach to this question. He said: "There are people who believe that revolution can break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement. These people are either mad or they are provocateurs."²

Lenin's teaching on the need to wage a relentless struggle against adventurism in the revolutionary movement remains significant today. Indeed despite the vast experience gained by the international communist movement and the working-class and national-liberation movements, revolutionaries in many countries are still compelled to defend Marxist ideas and fight against "left" phraseology, the attempts to re-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 71-72.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 480.

place class struggle by all kind of ventures and "palace coups."

Such attempts are being carried out, for instance, by the Mao group. Openly ignoring Marxist-Leninist teaching, the Peking leaders are trying to impose "the thought of Mao Tse-tung" on the communist movement in Asia and other regions of the world. Their schismatic policies have already done great damage to the communist parties in a number of South-Eastern Asian countries. We know what price the Indonesian people have had to pay for the attempts to apply some of the Maoist ideas in Indonesia. The Communist Party of Indonesia had a huge membership of some 3 million. In the early 1960s its leaders began to surrender themselves to the will of the Peking leaders who sought to turn Indonesia into a "testing ground" for Mao's ideas. Some CPI leaders took a wrong adventuristic path, instead of conducting a wide-scale class struggle and relying on the masses in their fight against the reaction. They came to support the conspiratorial line of the army officers. As it became clear later, broad sections of rank-and-file party members were not informed of such plans, which were known only to a narrow circle of leaders. The rebellion against the reactionary generals, which was called the "September 30 movement," proved to be poorly prepared, its leaders having no clear-cut, carefully elaborated programme of action and receiving no support from the working people.

The "September 30 movement" turned out to be an adventuristic move doomed to failure. The reactionary generals took advantage of this event and carried out their coup at the earliest possible moment. The communist party and the numerous organisations of the working people, unprepared for battle with the counter-revolu-

tion, could not offer any resistance. The communist party was crushed. Hundreds of thousands of communists, among them party leaders and functionaries, were killed. Anti-communist hysteria swept the country, driving the communist party underground. Indonesia had fallen into the manacles of reaction. The Mao group thus objectively had played into the hands of the reactionary forces.

The tragedy of the Indonesian Communist Party and the entire Indonesian people, which communists throughout the world feel deeply about, shows the immense danger of adventurist-tactics to the revolutionary movement.

As Lenin repeatedly stressed, a communist party's ability to change quickly its method of revolutionary struggle as the situation changes is one of the main indications of its political maturity. In order to attain their ultimate goals, the communists must employ with skill all forms of revolutionary struggle. This important Leninist principle remains valid today.

Can you conceive of a craftsman who always uses the same tool no matter what he is making and what material he is working with? Of course not. Such a strange craftsman could hardly be a successful one and would be of no use to the community. A similar situation may exist in political life, except that the political leader who uses only one form of struggle in all circumstances does not merely hurt himself but does harm to the social forces on whose behalf he acts.

A characteristic feature of Leninism is that it places no faith in universal forms of struggle, forms that are applicable in all situations. The most revolutionary slogan calling for the most radical form of struggle is meaningless if it does not reflect the specific characteristics of a gi-

ven stage of revolutionary development and the actual situation. What once played a revolutionary role may be harmful to the revolution under different circumstances. As Lenin said: "Just as harmful is the opposite mistake, when people refuse to reckon with the actual situation that has arisen and the actual conditions of the particular mass movement, because of a slogan misinterpreted as unchangeable. Such an application of a slogan inevitably degenerates into revolutionary phrase-mongering."¹ True revolutionism, Lenin believed, means the ability to determine which policy should be followed in a given situation.

Unfortunately, there are many instances in the history of the revolutionary movement of the violation of this important Leninist principle accompanied by sad consequences. The policy of the Mao group is one such example. In opposition to Marxism-Leninism, the Maoists cultivate only one method of revolutionary struggle—the armed struggle. In the conditions of a protracted civil war and armed resistance against the Japanese invaders Mao's words spoken in 1938 to the effect that in China "the gun creates power" fully accorded with the situation existing at that time. But already then Mao claimed that the specific features of the struggle in China were of universal importance. His article on arms being the source of power begins with the following assertion: "The main objective as well as the highest form of the revolution is the seizure of power by an armed method, i.e., the solution of the problem through war. This revolutionary principle of Marxism-Leninism is universally correct; it is unquestionably correct both for China and other countries."

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, p. 215.

Ascribing to Marxism-Leninism this absurd view which reduces the various forms of the working people's revolutionary movement to war, Mao has come to regard the attitude towards armed struggle as the yardstick of revolutionism. Those who take other forms of struggle into consideration are branded by Mao and his supporters in China as pseudo-revolutionaries. Accordingly, the Peking leaders call for armed struggle not only in all the capitalist countries but also in such countries as the UAR, Algeria, Syria and others where progressive social changes are under way.

What the Mao group call "genuine Marxism-Leninism" has nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, which teaches that revolution cannot develop everywhere according to one pattern since the world revolutionary process is of a large scope and conditions vary from one country to another. Power takeover by the working people may proceed differently in different countries. At the same time armed struggle is not ruled out as a means of abolishing the old order. Under military dictatorships, in conditions of full suppression of democratic freedoms, one cannot expect social changes to take place without armed struggle.

Historical experience as generalised by Marxism-Leninism shows that success of armed action decidedly depends on its being thoroughly prepared beforehand and supported by the revolutionary-minded masses. Otherwise, it may turn into a venture for which the people will have to pay dearly. A month before the October Revolution took place, Lenin addressed his Party comrades with the following words: "But armed uprising is a *special* form of political struggle, one subject to special laws to which attentive thought must be given. Karl Marx expressed this truth with remarkable clarity when he wro-

te that 'insurrection is an art quite as much as war'." ¹

In this letter he also called their attention to a number of important rules concerning the "art of uprising": one must act resolutely and bravely, never "play" with the idea of uprising, ensure "tremendous superiority of forces" at the crucial point and at the critical moment.

Marxism-Leninism does not treat the question of armed struggle by itself, but relates it to the development of the mass movement. In his article "On Revolutionary Phrase" (1918) Lenin wrote: "...resistance to reaction helps the revolution only when it is *expedient*... We Marxists have always been proud that we determined the expediency of any form of struggle by a precise calculation of the mass forces and class relationships. We have said that an insurrection is not always expedient; unless the prerequisites exist among the masses it is a gamble." ²

Here we see the great difference between this approach to methods of armed struggle and the approach of Mao Tse-tung and his followers who pride themselves on their "revolutionary radicalism."

It is only natural that the communist parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism should resolutely oppose a dogmatic approach to tactics of the revolutionary struggle. They are for the flexible application of tactics and methods in accordance with the obtaining situation. If the objective conditions in a country permit peaceful methods of struggle, the communists accept this form of revolutionary action. It is to be noted, however, that unlike social reformists, true Marxist-Leninists do not absolutise peaceful methods of struggle but consider them as one form of revolution-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 179.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 24.

ary struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. They are utterly opposed to the narrow practicality of the reformists who merely seek "to improve" capitalist society slightly. But while denouncing reformism, Leninism does not regard the struggle for reforms and parliamentary activities as manifestations of reformism, provided they are conducted for the sake of achieving the ultimate revolutionary goals rather than merely satisfying some minor demands. The communists have always believed that the struggle for reforms and the struggle for revolution were connected insofar as every concession wrung from capital was in the final analysis a result of revolutionary struggle and could become a step towards further progress. The communists have always fought against opportunist distortions of the peaceful forms of struggle. Yet this does not mean these forms should be abandoned altogether.

The "Mao-think" advocates have an entirely different idea of the peaceful forms of struggle: Maoism completely rejects the possibility of utilising the institutions of bourgeois democracy for revolutionary purposes. As previously mentioned, it regards armed struggle as the only acceptable form of struggle for power. This erroneous course that the Maoists imposed on the communists in Asian and African countries by means of propaganda and at times by gross force has time and again led to tragic consequences.

How is it possible then to determine the form of struggle which best accords with the concrete realities in a given country? On studying the experience of the 1905 revolutionary battles in Russia Lenin concluded there was a complex inter-relation between the content of the revolutionary struggle, the previous revolutionary experience, and the forms of counter-revolutionary resistance.

It follows that forms of struggle cannot be conceived at an office desk. They come about in the course of revolutionary activities and may acquire a very unexpected character. Marxist-Leninists do not think up the forms of struggle but constantly search for them in their work with the masses, developing what the masses originate. No one thought up the Soviets of Workers' Deputies which were to become the organs of the revolutionary uprising and the embryo of working-class rule in Russia. No one thought up the concrete forms of the popular front in the countries of East Europe which played a remarkable role in the struggle against fascism and became after the rout of Hitlerism, the foundation of people's democracy in many countries.

There is a vital force to that which results from the creativity of the masses. However, Lenin never felt that communists could passively wait for some forms of struggle to come about in the course of revolutionary experience. He explained the importance of the first push, of the communists' duty to display initiative, to take an active part in working out the methods and means of struggle. Lenin warned that mistakes could be made in the process. The risk of the "first push" has nothing in common with the recklessness of political adventurers. When there is an objective need to step up the struggle, party initiative can serve as the spark that ignites the flames of mass movement. The party's political maturity is expressed in its ability to evaluate the situation correctly and swiftly turn from some forms of struggle to others that promote the upsurge of the revolutionary movement.

Marxism-Leninism, potent and ever developing, is absolutely opposed to abstract or pat formulas. True Marxist-Leninists do not think up the forms of revolutionary struggle but closely follow the experiences, the real mass struggle

being waged by the people. As the revolutionary movement develops and the fighting masses become more politically conscious, new diverse ways and forms of struggle emerge. The communists consider it their duty to generalise and organise these forms, to make them purposeful.

Marxism-Leninism requires a historically concrete approach to the study of the forms of struggle. To accept or reject a given form of struggle without a historical analysis of the concrete conditions of a given movement at a given stage is contrary to the idea of a responsible approach to revolutionary struggle and inevitably leads to defeat. The choice of the form of struggle depends on the political, national, cultural and every-day life conditions.

A revolutionary movement—a class or national-liberation struggle—goes through different stages of development which are characterised by varying intensity of the struggle. The acuteness of the struggle determines the corresponding varied forms of struggle. Lenin said that “in certain periods of acute economic and political crises the class struggle ripens into a direct civil war.”¹

Class struggle does not accidentally, or because of someone's whim or ill will, turn into civil war. It is the result of a lengthy process of revolutionary development. Clashes and economic and political battles recur, develop, spread and become more heated finally reaching a point where they turn into the armed struggle of one class against another. In some cases it is a short-lived uprising of the people against the government, over a limited area. In others, it is the more complex form of lengthy civil war involving the whole country, i.e., armed struggle between two parts of a nation. This war is usual-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 11, p. 219.

ly a sequence of big battles at intervals that are relatively far apart with numerous small guerilla fights in between. Guerilla struggle is the armed struggle of individuals or small groups, at a time of extreme sharpening of the national-liberation or class struggle. A guerilla war originates when the people's struggle in a given region has reached fever-pitch but conditions are still not ripe for decisive battles.

When is guerilla warfare inevitable? Lenin believed that guerilla warfare was inevitable at a time when the mass movement had actually reached the point of uprising and there were more or less lengthy intervals between the "big battles" of the civil war. This means that the main question regarding conditions for the onset of guerilla struggle is not an organisational matter but a socio-political. It is a question of whether or not the mass movement has actually reached the point of uprising, whether or not there has been an extreme sharpening of social contradictions in the given country.

Can guerilla struggle be considered the main and exclusive form of struggle? No, it cannot. Lenin answered this question as follows: "This form of struggle was adopted as the preferable and even *exclusive* form of social struggle by the vagabond elements of the population, the lumpen proletariat and anarchist groups."¹ Explicating his idea, Lenin added: "The party of the proletariat can never regard guerilla warfare as the only, or even as the chief, method of struggle; it means that this methods must be subordinated to other methods, that it must be commensurate with the chief methods of warfare, and must be ennobled by the enlightening and organising influence of socialism."²

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 11, p. 216.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 11, p. 221.

Exaggeration of the significance of guerilla warfare, its absolutisation and separation from concrete conditions of place and time inevitably lead to unfavourable or even fatal results.

An irresponsible approach to this question is exemplified by Peking's frequent exhortations to foment guerilla anti-government struggle in Burma and Malaysia, that recently were again loudly voiced after the opening of the so-called "the 9th CPC Congress." Meanwhile the development of the last two decades in Burma and Malaysia clearly indicate that the guerilla movement inevitably loses popular support and degenerates unless it is based on objective social and political grounds. Recent developments in Indonesia also confirm the correctness of this. Ignoring Leninist stipulations that armed guerilla struggle can only be successful if it has been thoroughly organised and has the support of the popular masses, present-day Maoists have called on Indonesian communists to withdraw to the jungles and from there start guerilla actions against the regular army and police units. Appealing to the sentiments of those repressed by the reactionaries, the Maoists have involved many Indonesian patriots in this venture. Lacking effective support of the masses, their hastily recruited detachments fell easy prey to the punitive forces. Thousands of Indonesian revolutionaries perished. That was how the Mao Tse-tung group, which is attempting to foist its own "way of revolution" on the communist movement in Asia, has done Indonesian reaction a good turn, and hurled what was left of the blood-drained Indonesian Communist Party onto army bayonets.

Guerilla warfare is only effective when it is the struggle of the masses, although the guerillas operate in small groups. It can be successful only if the fighters have contact with the masses and the local population, and have their sup-

port. If the people do not know or appreciate what the guerillas are about, if they don't feel the guerillas are espousing their cause, they will naturally refrain from helping or joining in and nothing will come of the struggle. If these guerillas do not understand the sentiments of the working people round them and have no contacts with them, it is not a guerilla unit in the true sense of the word. If, on considering the conditions for the onset of guerilla struggle one thinks more about a favourable geographical position, about dense woods or high mountains than prevailing social conditions and the sentiments of the working people and exploited masses, if there is greater concern for the state of stockpiles of arms than the masses' readiness for joint actions, the struggle is hopeless, it is not true guerilla warfare.

It becomes genuine guerilla warfare, mass popular struggle only when it changes over from isolated actions of terrorists and plotters to a nation-wide struggle, when it becomes the common cause of the oppressed and exploited.

Guerilla warfare is not the form of struggle of one particular class, let us say the peasantry, as some would have it. Nor is it the form of struggle of certain peoples. It could be the form of struggle of workers and peasants and middle urban population.

The concrete historical forms of guerilla struggle are extremely diverse. It may constitute part of the people's revolutionary war in defence of their socialist system or the initial stage of the people's revolutionary war against foreign oppressors. It may be a struggle against a foreign army occupying part of the national territory, in support of the just struggle being waged by the national army. Such was the kind of struggle waged on a broad front on Soviet territory occupied by the fascist army during World War II.

It may be a struggle against a foreign army which has just defeated the national army. The guerilla struggle of the remainder of the national army and civilians makes it possible to muster fresh forces and lay the ground for big battles ahead. Such was the kind of struggle that the peoples of East Europe waged against German oppression. It may also be a continuation of the war of a people defeated by reactionaries—as was the case at one stage of the Spanish people's struggle. A national-liberation revolution may also acquire the nature of a guerilla war, if it becomes dragged out due to some circumstances as was the case in China. In conditions of a maturing revolutionary situation the onset of guerilla struggle against the reactionary regime in a country may become one of the greatest stimuli in the development of the revolutionary movement and its turning into a people's anti-tyranny revolution. The revolution in Cuba is an example of this. Guerilla fighting pertains in a greater or lesser degree to all civil and revolutionary wars. The successful struggle of the heroic people of Vietnam is a brilliant example of a skilful use of this form of struggle combined with other forms.

Referring to a political party's approach to guerilla warfare, Lenin demanded that revolutionaries should make a concrete historical analysis of every concrete socio-political situation. Under certain social conditions, guerilla warfare may become a futile form of anarchist activity, or an effective means of revolutionary struggle. Lenin concluded that in the epoch when the class struggle had become aggravated to the point of civil war, it was up to the communists to participate and also to direct the mass guerilla warfare of the masses. A Marxist-Leninist analysis of the various forms of the national-liberation and class movement is a reliable guide in the

peoples' revolutionary struggle against class and national oppression, for democracy, national independence and socialism.

On the eve of the Second Congress of the Comintern in July, 1920, Lenin worked out the stipulations for admission to that organisation. The Congress adopted them with a few amendments. One of the clauses said: "In countries where a state of siege or emergency legislation makes it impossible for Communists to conduct their activities legally, it is absolutely essential that legal and illegal work should be combined."¹

The rules of admission were intended to protect the newly-formed Communist International from parties that would be ready, in the event of a revolutionary upsurge, to declare themselves communist although in reality they were opportunist. As a rule parties of this kind are ready to renounce the revolutionary principles and bitter struggle as soon as their legal status is endangered. Lenin did not regard parties capable of buying legality at any price as revolutionary. He emphasised that the International should only admit organisations that considered it their duty to build up "*everywhere* . . . a parallel illegal organisation, which, at the decisive moment, will be in a position to help the Party fulfil its duty to the revolution."²

During the nearly fifty years that have passed since then the world has undergone drastic changes. The rout of fascism, the emergence of new socialist countries and the collapse of the colonial system are the factors that have extended the possibilities for the communist parties to function legally. But even today Lenin's principle of combining legal and illegal work has not

¹ V. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 208.

² *Ibid.*

lost its meaning as a major criterion of a revolutionary party for the following reasons.

More than half the communist parties functioning in capitalist countries and the countries of the third world are banned and forced to work underground. They are being brutally persecuted, and in some countries (Indonesia and the South African Republic, for instance) membership in the communist party is punishable by death. The reactionaries are massacring communists in Greece. Numerous party members have fallen victims to the fascist terror in Spain, Portugal and in Latin American countries.

Even in places where the communist parties are not officially banned there is constant persecution; to be a party member means to be ready to lose work, to be subject to slander or provocation. High-handed acts with regard to communists in capitalist countries only prove that even if the communist party is legal it must always be vigilant for this legality is only relative.

In view of this how obviously far-fetched is the reasoning of revisionists who argue that the experience acquired by the Russian communists before the revolution, when the party was underground, is only of historical interest. It would be very good if only it were true. Yet it is a fact that even today many communist parties are compelled to work illegally, underground, in short, just as Lenin said.

The fundamentals of any conspiratorial organisation are the correct distribution of duties and strict specialisation of the work being done. Lenin saw to it that this principle was strictly observed. In tsarist times, when the party of Bolsheviks was underground, it had a working rule that its different functions—the printing and distribution of literature, arranging for places of concealment, money raising, maintaining contact

between the central and local organisations and the smuggling of party workers abroad—were performed by different people who were able to concentrate on what did not appear to be spectacular but actually was heroic work. Each one knew only what was essential for his work and contacted only those whom he had to contact. Along with other principles of underground work this principle made it possible to protect the party and its leadership from persecution by the authorities.

Nevertheless Lenin's principle is not restricted to how to go about underground work, how to become a skilled conspirator. Lenin taught that these activities had to be combined with legal work. To forgo legal work might mean losing contact with the masses and a drastic drop in political influence.

After the rout of the Communist Party of Indonesia the Peking advisers began urging the communists to retreat to the jungles. "Strong points" were set up for conducting military actions against the regular army and the police. The wiping out of these "strong points" in the summer of 1968 resulted in more senseless bloodshed. The tragedy of the Indonesian Communist Party showed that, when isolated, underground activities cannot become a real political force.

The Malayan communists, also divorced from the masses, have on the advice of the Maoists been hiding in the jungles for several years now.

This is not the kind of underground work that Lenin meant. Lenin's major principle of underground activity is to combine illegal and legal work. This principle stems from the very nature of the Party, a party of the masses. And if circumstances force such a party underground, it has to make itself felt among the masses con-

stantly and to carry out an organisational and educational work among the working people.

The history of the international communist movement has confirmed the truth of this principle. No matter how violent the reactionaries are they cannot isolate the party from the masses completely or deprive it of all its legal power. The communists have long been convinced that a party connected with the masses will always be able to secure a base for itself in mass organisations even if it works underground. No matter how reactionary the political regime in the country is it cannot do away completely with mass organisations, it must have some semblance of an electoral system, etc., and this presents certain opportunities for legal revolutionary work.

The art of engaging in legal activity is no less and maybe even more difficult than the art of underground work. To learn to use legal possibilities means learning how to work in any organisation, even the most reactionary ones.

Communists working in legal organisations do not keep mum about the party, they do not try to conceal its existence. Wherever possible, they try to get across the party policy.

Some years ago quite a few communists in the Spanish and Portugese communist parties believed it was impossible to carry out any legal work under fascism and that it was necessary to abandon the work among the masses, to sit it out underground.

But this sectarian idea has been overcome in the Communist parties. A Guatemalan communist aptly expressed the need for combining illegal and legal work when he said he had become convinced from his own experience that "if no propaganda is carried out and the voice

of the party is not audible to the people it will be impossible to expect them to defend you, to protect you and follow you."

Lenin used to say (and it has been confirmed in practice) that there could not be successful legal activities in an anti-democratic state unless the activities were directed from underground, just as the underground organisations could not be effective unless numerous open organisations acted as a cover for them. Lenin never opposed underground work to legal activities but favoured a combination of the two.

But today the communist parties observing Leninist principles have not only to fight the profoundly erroneous sectarian approach of making a clean break with legal activities and regarding the rifle as the sole reliable weapon in the revolutionary struggle. They have also to fight the opportunist rejection of underground methods, a stand fraught with the danger of transforming the party from a militant revolutionary organisation into a conciliatory one.

Outwardly completely opposite stands—left sectarianism and right opportunism—both lead to one and the same end: to party inertness or defeat. Both stands actually amount to advocating passivity. Both lead to sitting back and waiting—sectarians for the day of revolution, opportunists for the gradual transformation of the reactionary regime. This is how opposites meet.

The communist parties have to function in different conditions in different countries and this determines the balance of legal and illegal activities. Revolutionary experience shows that only when a party observes the Leninist principle of combining legal and illegal work can it preserve its militant revolutionary spirit un-

der any circumstances, just as, in the final analysis, its close contact with the masses can also result in major successes in the interests of all working people.

The history of the revolutionary movement shows that the struggle does not develop evenly. It resembles more of a zigzag—successes alternate with setbacks and defeats are followed by victories.

The revolutionary parties have to function in incredibly difficult conditions, overcoming unexpected obstacles. And, whereas during a revolutionary upsurge tactical mistakes or miscalculations in policy may have serious consequences for the party, erroneous tactics when the revolution is at a low ebb and there is an outburst of reaction could put an end to the party. Therefore Leninism makes it imperative for each revolutionary party to study both its own experience and that of the revolutionary parties who have passed severe tests and even suffered defeats in the years of frenzied reaction but who have ultimately scored decisive victories. This will help to avoid grim consequences, to preserve the party and lead the people to victory.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have the opportunity of studying the historical experience of the first Russian Revolution of 1905. Lenin made a profound analysis of the history of that revolution and showed how a revolutionary party should act in a period of low ebb of revolution and rampant reaction.

The defeat of the 1905-1907 Revolution was followed by the most savage reaction. The tsar, landowners and capitalists took bitter vengeance on the working people for their part in the revolutionary movement. Punitive expeditions mercilessly massacred those who took part in

the revolution, particularly vanguard workers. The party of Bolsheviks suffered the most ruthless reprisals. The police wrought havoc with the leading party organisations, carried out mass arrests among communists, exiled and imprisoned them.

That was a grim period for the party of Bolsheviks. The situation was aggravated also by the fact that, from within, party policy was attacked by opportunists of all shades. Some demanded doing away with the illegal party, thereby actually advising that a halt be put to the struggle. Others were for having the party pursue a hazardous course of conspiracies and terrorist acts which would inevitably isolate the party from the masses. The party underwent a difficult crisis.

At that grim time Lenin outlined and substantiated the major task of the period: to preserve and strengthen the party, to maintain its contacts with the masses and prepare for fresh battles and a renewed revolutionary tide. Lenin also worked out the tactical principles and concrete tasks of the Bolshevik party. Taken together they afforded a clear idea of what a revolutionary party had to do during a low ebb in revolution and outburst of reaction. Had these principles not been observed and these concrete tasks not carried out it would have been impossible to achieve the main strategic goal.

Lenin held that in the event of the defeat of the revolution it was the prime duty of the revolutionary party to organise an orderly retreat. Lenin considered an orderly retreat to be a planned, well-organised retreat without the least confusion and panic. Organised retreat means preservation of the maximum party membership, unity of the party ranks and a militant spirit. Analysing the meaning of correct retreat and its significance for the party Lenin wrote

about the state of the party of Bolsheviks after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution: "Of all the defeated opposition and revolutionary parties, the Bolsheviks effected the most orderly retreat, with the least loss to their 'army', with its core best preserved, with the least significant splits (in point of depth and incurability), with the least demoralisation, and in the best condition to resume work on the broadest scale and in the most correct and energetic manner."¹

Lenin looked upon the ability to organise proper retreat as one of the major tactical means in the arsenal of the revolutionary party, a skill no less complex than that of offensive. He said that "the revolutionary parties had to complete their education. They were learning how to attack. . . . They had to realise—and it is from bitter experience that the revolutionary class learns to realise this—that victory is impossible unless one has learned how to attack and retreat properly."² Without acquiring the ability to make a retreat a revolutionary party cannot hope for success in the complex developments of revolutionary struggle.

At the same time Lenin warned the revolutionary party against the main danger which could impede correct retreat. That danger stemmed from the various opportunist elements within the party, people who sought to divert the party from a well-organised retreat either into pursuing a rash policy or one of unprincipled conciliation. Lenin emphasised that either way would mean the end of the party. It will be recalled that after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution and the period of reaction the Russian communists were able to organise a correct retreat and pre-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 28.

² Ibid.

serve most of the members and basically to continue their integral party policy owing to the fact that they "exposed and expelled the revolutionary phrase-mongers, those who did not wish to understand that one had to retreat, that one had to know how to retreat."¹

New tactics, Lenin believed, was the second important party task during the period of retreat of the revolution and onslaught of reaction. Lenin maintained that this task required a Marxist analysis of the current political situation in the country and the new policy of the reactionary forces, that the immediate tasks of struggle should be formulated and the lessons of the revolution be appraised; it was necessary to clarify the causes of the crisis in the party and work out ways to overcome it and to determine the correlation of legal and illegal party work. Finally, it was also necessary to determine the prerequisites for a new revolutionary tide and new revolution.

The analysis of the political situation includes a comprehensive characterisation of the state and inter-relation of different classes, population groups, an objective appraisal of the balance of class forces and the conduct of different political parties. The appraisal of the political situation should under no circumstances permit even the slightest embellishment or, conversely, exaggeration of a bad aspect which could stem from the subjective view or personal mood of a party worker. After the defeat of the 1905 Russian Revolution Lenin made a critical and objective estimation of the situation that had arisen. His words furnish a brilliant example of a realistic and sober approach to appraising realities: "Tsarism was victorious. All the revolutionary and

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 28.

opposition parties were smashed. Depression, demoralisation, splits, discord." ¹

The revolutionary party should have a clear idea of how reaction acts after the defeat of the revolution. Lenin showed that the Russian counter-revolution, the tsarist rulers and landowners essentially acted the same way after the 1905 Revolution as victorious counter-revolutionaries had acted in the past. The tsarist rulers and landowners furiously avenged themselves on the working class and the peasantry and tried to benefit from the lessons of the past and work out a new effective policy of struggle against the revolutionary forces to prevent a new revolution. Tsarist autocratic rule followed a policy of manoeuvring between the out-and-out reactionary landowner class which was its old feudal base, and the new capitalist plunderer in the village—the kulak class. Lenin exposed that manoeuvring as reaction's desire to find new, broader support in the country in order to fight the revolutionary working masses more effectively. That helped the party of Bolsheviks to work out correct tactics of revolutionary struggle and lead the Russian working class to new revolutionary battles.

Lenin emphasised that when a party was working out new revolutionary tactics during a period of retreat of the revolution it should determine with utmost precision the position of every class and the relation between them. The stratification of the class forces, which inevitably occurs during revolutionary battles and is fully apparent during a low ebb in the revolution, and reaction's offensive greatly facilitates this task. Simultaneously a more or less clear differentiation of the political parties representing definite classes also takes place. Such was the process that occurred after the 1905 Revolution when

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 27.

some sections of the Russian bourgeoisie, scared to death by the scale of the people's revolutionary struggle and by the working class, took the side of reaction in support of tsarist policy. The difference that was to be observed in the conduct of the different sections of the bourgeoisie when the revolution was in progress disappeared almost completely in the period of the retreat of the revolution.

The working out of new tactics, like the organisation of planned retreat, is inconceivable without unmasking the opportunists of all shades and the anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary essence of their views and policies. The Russian communists had to fight on two fronts after the 1905 Revolution in order to defend and preserve their party. On the one hand, Lenin and Bolsheviks waged a decisive struggle against opportunists in the party ranks, against those who demanded that the old revolutionary slogans be discarded. In reality that amounted to liquidation of the working-class party.

On the other hand, the Bolsheviks had to fight another group of opportunists, who, under cover of "left" phraseology, declared it was not fitting for revolutionaries to sit in the reactionary parliament and other legal organisations, that the place for revolutionaries was on the barricades. Their policy of rejecting legal forms of party work would have inevitably resulted in the party's isolation from the masses. Their reluctance to carry on every-day work with the masses, substituting revolutionary phraseology for such work, presented the greatest danger to the party, dooming it to passive expectation or pushing it to engage in leftist adventurist actions.

Analysing the activities of the Russian Communist Party after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, Lenin concluded it was impossible to work

out correct revolutionary tactics without fighting both the left and right opportunists.

Determining what could generate a new revolutionary upsurge Lenin showed that all the objective requisites that had caused the first Russian revolution still prevailed. After the defeat of the revolution not a single basic problem had been solved. A sharpening of the class struggle and new revolutionary tide were inevitable. Consequently, the party's strategy and tactical tasks stemmed from the objective need to prepare the working class and peasantry for a new revolution. As for tactics, they had to differ from the tactics the party employed during the period of revolutionary upsurge. It was necessary to change over from calling on the masses to overthrow autocracy, from such methods of direct revolutionary struggle as general strikes and armed uprisings, to persistent systematic work to educate and organise the working masses to thorough preparations for a new revolution. That goal meant the illegal party had to be preserved and consolidated and maximum use made of all legal possibilities for revolutionary work. That obliged the communists to learn how to correctly combine legal and illegal work under the guidance of the illegal party organisation. Lenin stressed that "it was this great defeat that taught the revolutionary parties and the revolutionary class a real and very useful lesson, a lesson in historical dialectics, a lesson in an understanding of the political struggle."¹

Although the communist and workers' parties have to function in vastly different conditions, modern political experience reconfirms that the development of the revolutionary movement in different countries is based on the general laws of history and class struggle. That is why the

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 27.

principles formulated by Lenin as to how a revolutionary party should function, principles that have been tested and confirmed by the experience of the party of Bolsheviks and other revolutionary parties, are of invaluable significance for the entire international communist movement and for the fighters for national independence in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

LENIN ON THE GENERAL LAWS OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND THE NON-CAPITALIST PATH OF DEVELOPMENT

Events in Asia, Africa, and Latin America show that the people of these continents are now faced with the need to decide which path to take to liberate themselves from age-old backwardness and work for economic and social progress. They see more and more clearly that material and technological advances, as achieved in the capitalist countries, do not deliver the working masses from the evils of social inequality and the exploitation of man by man. The peoples who have been freed from colonial rule are rejecting the capitalist path of development and turning to the experience of the Soviet Union and other countries that have already carried out a socialist revolution and are now building socialism. They are turning to this experience in order to learn the laws of the revolutionary process, which will help them find the right path of development.

This does not mean that the transition to socialism in any country will duplicate the process in Russia or other countries that chose socialism. As Lenin said: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of demo-

crazy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life.”¹

Much as the countries in Asia differ from those in Latin America in terms of the level of economic development, the strength of the working class, and the size and power of the national bourgeoisie, the laws for the transition to socialism both in Asia and Latin America are the same. National features do not alter the basic laws of the revolutionary process.

Overemphasizing the specific national features in the transition from capitalism to socialism, the refusal to abide by the basic laws of the process lead to disregard or revision of Marxist-Leninist teachings and the violation of the general principles of socialist upbuilding. A case in point is China. There is a dictatorship of glorified Mao. The masses have been deprived of their role in the governing of society. The country's economy stagnates, and living standards fail to rise. All this is a result of ignoring the basic laws of revolution by the Mao Tse-tung group. Their excessive emphasis on the special national features of the Chinese Revolution has not only placed them in opposition to other communist parties, but has turned them into partners of the imperialists fighting against socialism.

In studying the history and the laws governing the development of capitalist society, in analysing the nature and the prospects of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the classics of Marxism-Leninism came to the conclusion that socialism would inevitably replace capitalism. However, they pointed out, this change would take place not as a result of a gradual transformation of capitalism into social-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

ism or of wishful thinking on the part of heroic individuals. The working people can achieve liberation only when they take up active revolutionary struggle. Only by carrying out a socialist revolution and taking power into their own hands will the working people be able to start building a new socialist society.

Dictatorship is not something invented by Marxist-Leninists. It has been shown by Marx and Engels that in every society that is divided into classes, political power (and that means the whole state apparatus) is in the hands of the ruling class and serves the interests of that class. Though the forms of domination of the ruling classes may vary, their essence remains the same—the dictatorship of one or another class. In capitalist countries, the bourgeoisie is the ruling class. Economic and political power in the country lies in their hands, and the government exists to protect their interests and privileges.

Bourgeois ideologists do their best to confuse the working people with regard to the true nature of state power in a capitalist society. In the United States, for instance, there is a widespread theory of “people’s capitalism.” Its purpose is to conceal the acute class contradictions in US society and to make that society appear free and democratic. But it is not difficult to see just whose interests the US government serves. Do the American people need the war in Vietnam? Of course not. It is the bourgeois class, the US monopolists who make huge profits on the arms race that need this war. Is race discrimination possible in a truly democratic country? Again, no. But it exists in the United States, where protests by the Negro people are ruthlessly suppressed by the ruling class.

In capitalist countries the state apparatus, the army, police, and the courts serve and protect

the interests of the rich against the poor, the interests of the capitalists and landowners against the workers and peasants. Thus Marx and Engels taught that the working people could not win their freedom until they had liquidated the power of the capitalists and the landowners and established the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels wrote in the Communist Manifesto that "the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class."¹ They pointed out that the immediate task of the communists was "overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat."²

In studying the history of revolutionary struggle Marx and Engels concluded that one of the first acts of the proletariat after taking power should be the breaking of the old state machinery—the state apparatus, army, police, the courts and other bourgeois organs of power. "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest," wrote Marx and Engels, "by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class."³

This is exactly what the Russian workers did after the socialist revolution of 1917. Led by the Bolsheviki, they established, in the difficult conditions of the Civil War, entirely new state organs—the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies. They replaced the old courts by people's courts which would protect the interests of the revolution. And they organised the Red Army to defend the young Soviet Republic.

Proletarian dictatorship is necessary to the

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels. *Sel. Works*, Vol. I, p. 53.

² K. Marx, F. Engels. *Sel. Works*, Vol. I, p. 46.

³ K. Marx, F. Engels. *Sel. Works*, Vol. I, p. 53.

working people not only during the first days of the revolution, when the struggle against the bourgeoisie is most acute but also for a long period of time after the bourgeoisie has been overthrown. Marx wrote in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*." ¹

Marx and Engels consistently fought against all kinds of opportunists who attempted to deny the necessity of a dictatorship of the proletariat. After the death of Marx and Engels, the leaders of the right wing of European social-democrats who claimed the role of spokesmen and the only consistent ideologists of the working class tried to bury the ideas of the founders of scientific socialism concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat. When the socialist revolution had been successfully carried out in Russia and the dictatorship of the proletariat established, they began a campaign of slander against it asserting that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a negation of democracy and freedom.

Answering such critics of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin pointed out that proletarian dictatorship means genuine democracy for the working people, a democracy for the overwhelming majority of the population in a country. In this respect it is basically different from a bourgeois democracy which is nothing but a political form of domination of the bourgeoisie. Lenin wrote: "Bourgeois democracy... always remains, and under capitalism is bound to remain, restricted, truncated, false and hypocriti-

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels. *Sel. Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 32-33.

cal, a paradise for the rich and a snare and deception for the exploited, for the poor.”¹

Things are different under the dictatorship of the proletariat. This does not mean that there will be absolute freedom. On the contrary. “The dictatorship of the proletariat,” Lenin wrote, “imposes a series of restrictions on the freedom of the oppressors, the exploiters, the capitalists.”² But at the same time the dictatorship of the proletariat means a broad democracy for the poor, for the people.

That is the basic difference between power in the hands of the working people and domination of the bourgeoisie.

Lenin strongly criticised bourgeois ideologists who pictured the dictatorship of the proletariat as a type of power capable only of destroying what mankind had created but incapable of initiating creative efforts on its own.

To be sure, the working people cannot win victory over their class enemies without breaking the old, bourgeois state machinery, without liquidating the system of private property, without destroying the influence of bourgeois ideology. Such actions, Lenin pointed out, represented only one part of the task of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The other part, the most important and difficult, was the establishment of a new, socialist state.

In the first years following the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, the liquidation of the old state apparatus was accompanied by the creation of a new apparatus, the abolishment of the system of private property was followed by the creation of people's property. The first decrees issued by Soviet power, the power of the working people, were aimed at

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 243.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 461.

nationalising the land, industry, banks and transport, building up the country's economy and raising the people's living standards. The tremendous achievements of the USSR today are, in the final analysis, the result of the creative efforts of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin also pointed out the mistakes of those who saw in the dictatorship of the proletariat only that side that involved the use of force. He showed that the power of the working people could not avoid the use of force with respect to the bourgeoisie and other exploiters, that it was compelled to do so in order to protect the gains of the revolution from the forces of counter-revolution and defeat their attempts to overthrow the revolutionary regime.

The young Soviet state had to use force during the years of the Civil War. The Russian workers and peasants defended their country, with gun in hand, from the attacks of the exploiters, that is, the Russian capitalists and landowners who had been overthrown.

The Soviet state again had to use force in order to repel the onslaught of fourteen foreign countries acting in conjunction with the internal counter-revolution.

Yes, this was the use of force, but only in order to safeguard the gains of the world's first state of workers and peasants.

The need to use force for the defence of the interests of the dictatorship of the proletariat still exists today, for there remain forces in the world that would like to turn back the clock of history. Nevertheless, as noted earlier, the most important aspect of the dictatorship of the proletariat is seen in its organisational, creative activities. In the years of Soviet government, a powerful army has been built up which safeguards the interests of the working people and

world peace; a strong socialist economy has been created; and the people's living standards and cultural level have been rising rapidly. The people have come to have a completely new attitude towards labour and public property. It is as a result of the organisational and educational work carried out by the Soviet state that the USSR has succeeded in a historically short period of time in overcoming the backwardness inherited from the past and become one of the most highly developed countries in the world.

Lenin showed in his works why it was necessary to establish the power of the working people for the building of socialism. He pointed out that only the working class was sufficiently well organised and had the necessary political consciousness to become the leader of a socialist revolution. The working class had no private property and was thus objectively able to remain consistent in the struggle against capitalism. Prior to the Russian Socialist Revolution of 1917, the working class of the country was not numerous as compared with the peasantry. Nevertheless, owing to its specific qualities the working class became the leader of the working people of Russia in their fight to overthrow tsarism and liquidate capitalism.

At the same time, Lenin was the first of the Marxists to show that the working class could successfully carry out their dictatorship only in close alliance with other working people, above all the peasantry. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," wrote Lenin, "is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these strata, an alliance against capital, an

alliance whose aim is the complete overthrow of capital, complete suppression of the resistance offered by the bourgeoisie as well as of attempts at restoration on its part, an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of socialism.”¹

While pointing out the tremendous importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat for the liquidation of capitalism and the victory of socialism, Lenin taught that it would not exist forever. For the proletariat needed dictatorship not in order to establish its domination for all time, but in order to build a classless society and create the conditions for the withering away of the state. The road leading to this goal is not an easy one; it will be long and complex.

The victorious socialist revolution in Russia and some other European and Asian countries proved the correctness of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin concerning the significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. History has shown that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the main weapon of the working people in their struggle against capitalism, for socialism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat assumed different forms in different countries and in different historical conditions. “The transition from capitalism to communism,” Lenin wrote, “is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat*.”²

What does the working class need in order to carry out its tasks as the ruling power? The dictatorship of the proletariat derives its strength mainly from the fact that it is based on the in-

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 381.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 413.

dustrial workers' alliance with the working masses, notably the peasantry. The workers lead the peasants and all the petty-bourgeois sections of society, gradually freeing them from the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois views.

This is achieved by persuasion, friendly aid, and example. In dealing with the peasants and the petty-bourgeois sections of the population, the dictatorship of the proletariat rejects the use of force; it does not resort to expropriation or suppression. Lenin insisted that there must be no issuing of orders and commands in dealing with the peasants.

In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, there has been a tendency towards broader alliance among all democratic elements on which the rule of the working class is based. Immediately after the revolution in Russia, such an alliance included the poorest strata of the peasantry. Later, it was joined by the rest of the working peasantry. In the people's democracies, right after the socialist revolution, the working class formed alliance with the entire working peasantry, the small employers in the cities, and other democratic forces.

This development has particular significance for Asia, Africa, and Latin America today. There, the working class, as a rule, is small and often weakly organised. The overwhelming majority of the population are farmers. In such conditions, the working class could carry out its historical mission as leader of the revolution only by maintaining the closest alliance with all non-proletarian masses of working people and leading them forward. At certain stages, the national bourgeoisie could become an ally of the working class, since revolutions in countries liberated from imperialist rule invariably become anti-colonialist.

In the report of the commission on national and colonial problems for the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin pointed out that the emergence of a socialist state radically changed the correlation of forces in the world in favour of the national-liberation movement, since it would have more experience of struggle to draw on. For the national-liberation movement Soviet Russia was a source of political, material and moral support. Lenin advised the communists of the East to study the experience of the revolutionary movement in Russia, in its national areas.

Most inhabitants of the outlying national districts of Russia, such as Turkestan, were peasants. There was almost no industrial proletariat, and pre-capitalist relations prevailed. Thus there could be no purely proletarian movement in the national districts of Russia. Lenin wrote: "Nevertheless, we have assumed, we must assume, the role of leader even there... to inspire in the masses an urge for independent political thinking and independent political action."¹

Peasant councils were set up in the national areas, and Lenin advised the communists of the East to have this particular kind of political organisation. "The Communist International's theses should point out that peasants' Soviets, Soviets of the exploited," Lenin said, "are a weapon which can be employed, not only in capitalist countries but also in countries with pre-capitalist relations..."²

At the same time, however, Lenin warned that such councils should not be organised unless conditions permitted. What conditions did Lenin have in mind? Above all, it was the possibility

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 243.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 243.

for the working people of the backward countries to receive aid from the proletariat of the Soviet republics.

History showed that Lenin was right. The People's Khurals in the Tuvian and Mongolian People's Republics, which were actually peasant councils, were able to defend the right of their people to independence in the early twenties only because they had the support and aid of the Soviet Republic.

At the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin also proposed the idea that it would be possible for the oppressed people to go from the pre-capitalist form of economy to the socialist form, by-passing the capitalist stage. "The Communist International," Lenin said, "should advance the proposition, with the appropriate theoretical grounding, that with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage."¹

Lenin's idea was confirmed in Russia. The communists of the former backward regions of tsarist Russia led the successful transition in the process of which their people went from the pre-capitalist form of society to socialism. This historical process took place in rather favourable conditions. Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Tadjikistan and other outlying districts of Russia developed within a united workers' and peasants' socialist state. The peoples of the Tuvian and the Mongolian People's Republics, who under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Parties took the non-capitalist path of development, received all-round support from

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

their neighbour, the Soviet socialist state.

Many colonial and dependent countries profited from the experience of the struggle of the peoples in the outlying districts of Russia, of Tuva and Mongolia after 1945, when Hitler's Germany and its allies were defeated, and the international situation changed in favour of socialism. A number of Asian and African countries came to take the non-capitalist path of development, and a socialist government was established in China, North Vietnam and North Korea. The peoples of the United Arab Republic, Burma, Algeria, Mali and Syria rejected the capitalist path. They declared that they would take the socialist path of economic and social development and began to build their economic and social relations on a socialist basis. The success of this process varies from one country to another, but, as Lenin foresaw, it is being fully supported, ideologically, politically and militarily, by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries as well as by the international working class.

Leninism showed that only Marxist-Leninists, armed with the theory of scientific socialism, can ultimately succeed in leading a country to the building of socialist relations, to communism. But what should be done in a country with a pre-capitalist system, with no industry and proletariat and, consequently no Communist Party? What should be done if the democratic forces of such a country take over leadership of the country, and do not want to follow the path of capitalism?

Such a situation existed in Mongolia in the early twenties. The Mongolian people chose the non-capitalist path of development. Talking with a delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic in November 1921, Lenin stressed that the suc-

cess of the development along such a path in the conditions of a people's democratic state should be ensured by the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. Members of the delegation asked Lenin whether in such a case it would be better to change the name of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party to the communist party. Lenin replied that the revolutionaries had a great deal to do in their state, in the field of economy and culture before the shepherd elements could become the proletarian masses which would, in the long run, help to "transform" the people's revolutionary party into the communist. It would be very dangerous and harmful just to change the name, Lenin warned.

Naturally, this cannot be the solution for all countries which have similar conditions as Mongolia in the twenties, a country of herdsmen. But what is important, and this remains valid today, is what Lenin said regarding the development along a non-capitalist path in a country where there was no dictatorship of the proletariat but where people's power had been established; in such cases, Lenin said, it was not necessary to have a communist party. A people's party, which represents the interests of all the working people, will be able to put an end to the development of capitalism. In the course of the development of the national economy, which will be led by such a party, a working class will come into being and a general proletarian outlook will emerge. Thus conditions will be created for the formation of a Marxist-Leninist party, which will, on the basis of scientific socialism, improve the economic and social life in a former colonial or dependent country and direct it along the path of socialism. Assistance and support from socialist countries is of major importance in this respect.

Lenin's theory of a socialist revolution under-

went rigid tests in Russia. The theory withstood the tests, and can be successfully applied by revolutionaries in other countries. Of international significance is Lenin's teaching on cultural revolution as a part of the socialist revolution.

Lenin taught that the dictatorship of the proletariat, established as a result of the socialist revolution, is necessary for two important reasons: to protect the gains of the revolution from internal and foreign enemies, and to launch the building of socialism.

It is necessary to liquidate private ownership of the means of production, so that the building of a socialist economy can begin. It is also necessary to abolish the exploitation of man by man, and to build a powerful industry and a well-developed collective-farm system. The accomplishment of these tasks, according to Lenin, is impossible without a cultural revolution.

Cultural revolution means a complete change in the spiritual life of the people, which is closely related to changes in their material life. When a dictatorship of the proletariat carries out basic changes in the relations between the people in the political and economic spheres, it at the same time changes their spiritual life. Marx and Engels wrote that the working people needed a cultural revolution not only for changing the existing conditions based on the exploitation of man by man, but for changing themselves.

Just what does the spiritual transformation of society mean in the period of building socialism? It means, first of all, the education of all members of society based on Marxism-Leninism. This is followed by the elimination of the ideological influence of the exploiting classes on the working people. Ultimately, it means the bringing up of the new man, who is highly cul-

tured and capable of taking part in the shaping of the new society. Lenin taught that a cultural revolution "must be a veritable revolution—the entire people must go through a period of cultural development."¹

Fifty years ago, the enemies of the Russian socialist revolution maintained that it was impossible to carry out a socialist revolution in Russia owing to the backwardness of the people. Until capitalism had "civilised" Russia, they claimed, the working class should not make a revolution and establish its dictatorship. They asserted that if the Russian working class did take over power, it would be unable to build up a socialist culture. Though history has proved such views to be wrong, they may still be heard today in connection with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Lenin pointed out that with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the technical, economic and cultural development of Russia would advance at a much faster rate than under capitalist conditions. The prerequisite for making Russia a civilised country was the overthrow of the big landowners and capitalists. The Russian communists did exactly as Lenin taught. The Soviet Union, which today marches in the forefront of social and cultural progress, is proof that Lenin was correct.

It is impossible to build up the material and technical basis of socialism and communism or to have socialist and communist production relations, or to inculcate in people a new world outlook without a successful cultural revolution. And the material basis of this new culture, without which it cannot go forward, consists of a

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 470.

highly developed industry and a socialist system of agriculture.

The proletariat plays a significant role in the cultural revolution, for the proletariat is the best organised and most politically conscious class. Only the proletariat is capable of mobilising the entire population for the liquidation of illiteracy and cultural backwardness and for coping with the questions of scientific and cultural advance.

Lenin taught that in carrying out a cultural revolution it was necessary to pay attention to the cultural heritage of the past, to study and understand all that was valuable. In his book *On the Significance of Militant Materialism* Lenin wrote: "It would be the biggest and most grievous mistake a Marxist could make to think that the millions of the people (especially the peasants and artisans), who have been condemned by all modern society to darkness, ignorance and superstition, can extricate themselves from this darkness only along the straight line of a purely Marxist education."¹

Lenin pointed out that in educating the working people the communist party should make wide use of the classical heritage. He emphasised that it was necessary to utilise the cultural and technical development under capitalism and the experience of the specialists trained under capitalism. At the same time, Lenin taught, this cultural heritage should be regarded critically and creatively, so that only the progressive elements were utilised while the reactionary elements were discarded. It was important, he said, to enrich this heritage on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 230.

The cultural revolution is of such a nature that its tasks cannot be fulfilled as quickly as political or military tasks. A war, as Lenin pointed out, can be won in a few months, but questions of culture cannot be settled in a hurry. Here what is called for is persistent, organisational work over a long period of time.

The very term "cultural revolution" has been vulgarised by the Mao Tse-tung group. In present-day China the destruction of communist party organisations and the liquidation of all whom Mao does not like, among them people well-known in the world of culture, are dubbed as a cultural revolution. Mao Tse-tung calls a cultural revolution the destruction of works of art, the obliteration from the people's minds of China's rich cultural heritage and the attempts to transform the people into stupid, unthinking executors of Mao's will.

In the Soviet Union, the term "cultural revolution" means the following: the all-round development of the system of education on a scientific basis; the training of a large number of intellectuals from among the people and the maximum utilisation of the older generation of specialists educated before the revolution; and the development of the spiritual life of the nation on a scientific basis.

Guided by the teachings of Lenin, the Soviet Communist Party coped with various concrete problems relating to cultural development in all stages of building socialist society.

In the first stage of the development of Soviet society, immediately after the Revolution, the Party paid particular attention to liquidating illiteracy among the adults, to changing the system of school education, and to improving the political education of the broad masses.

Pre-revolutionary Russia was an extremely

backward country, and thus one of the main tasks of the Soviet government was the liquidation of illiteracy. An illiterate person, Lenin said, was someone far removed from politics. The literate section of the population was called upon to teach the illiterate.

The next stage, after illiteracy was wiped out, was the introduction of a general and compulsory elementary education. In 1930, a seven-year compulsory education was introduced. By 1939, 87 per cent of the population in the Soviet Union were literate as compared with 30 per cent in pre-revolutionary Russia. During the twenty postwar years the number of school-children doubled.

No other country in the world has witnessed such a tremendous growth of cultural and educational establishments—libraries, museums, theatres, etc., as the Soviet Union. At present, there are 7,700 newspapers published in the country and almost four thousand magazines.

The Soviet Union has specialists in all fields of production and culture. They grew up as the cultural revolution was being carried out. The number of people with a college or specialised secondary education has increased from 190 thousand in 1913 to 18.3 million in 1966. The USSR has more engineers than the United States.

The successful development of education, the training of Soviet intellectuals in ever increasing numbers, the flourishing of culture among the working people—all these have created favourable conditions for the development of science. The achievements of Soviet scientists—chemists, physicists, space explorers—are well known. Soviet scholars are successfully coping with problems in economics, philosophy, history and sociology. Soviet literature and art

are known throughout the world. All these achievements of the USSR are the result of the consistent application of Marxist-Leninist theories which are being creatively developed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

LENIN ON PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM AND UNITY OF THE WORLD ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT

Proletarian internationalism is a vital principle of the ideology and policies of the working class and the communist parties, expressing the common interests and solidarity of the working people throughout the world. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were the first to elaborate the fundamentals of proletarian internationalism. They proceeded from the fact that capitalism was an international force, and international unity and a brotherhood of workers was needed to defeat it. This was expressed in their slogan, "Workers of all lands, unite!"

In the new historical era—the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions—it was Lenin who developed the principles of proletarian internationalism. Lenin explained that under imperialism capital was shedding its national skin, capital was becoming more international and the economic interdependence of states more pronounced. All this increased the need for greater international solidarity of the proletariat and all working people in the struggle against capital.

For this reason Lenin always stressed the need to examine the tasks of the liberation movement in each country as part of the strug-

gle to eradicate imperialist oppression throughout the world. He pointed out that a revolutionary Marxist party should act not as an isolated national unit, but as a component part of the international revolutionary movement.

The victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia signified the triumph of the ideas of proletarian internationalism. It was made possible by the consistent internationalist policy of the Bolshevik party which had rallied the working people of multi-national Russia around the working class in the struggle for socialism. The joint aid and support of the working people in the capitalist countries to the newly born Soviet republic prevented the imperialist bourgeoisie from strangling the republic, thus making the victory of the revolution more secure.

The October Revolution precipitated the development of the ideas of proletarian internationalism and their spread throughout the world. The revolution in Russia extended the boundaries of the world revolutionary movement. The peoples in the colonies and dependent countries, oppressed by imperialism, joined the movement. At that moment the Communist International advanced a new and much broader slogan, "Workers of all lands and oppressed peoples, unite!" Thus it was stressed that the victory over world capital could be won only through joint efforts, through a common struggle of the world proletariat and the peoples oppressed by imperialism.

The contemporary world revolutionary movement is becoming ever broader in scope; additional millions of working people in the capitalist countries and the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America have been drawn into the liberation struggle. Simultaneously the process of tying in the interests of all revolutionary forces is taking place. These forces, regardless of

which aspect of the liberation struggle is entailed, have common interests in the fight for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. They face a common enemy—imperialism.

Of particular importance for the world revolutionary movement is the close cooperation of its main aspects—the world system of socialism, the labour movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement. This cooperation has already borne fruit. The socialist countries have given decisive aid to the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries of Asia and Africa, and are giving such aid during the new stage of this movement, the struggle for economic independence and for resolving social problems. Direct ties, cooperation and mutual support between the socialist countries and the labour movement in the capitalist countries, between the labour and national-liberation movements have been extended.

Today, intensification of imperialism's aggressiveness makes greater unity of the revolutionary forces imperative. The contemporary situation confirms Lenin's premise that the bourgeoisie in all countries, despite the contradictions tearing it apart, is rallying on a world-wide scale to preserve its class domination. The imperialists are making use of inter-state economic amalgamations of capital to undermine and crush the mass workers' movement. Headed by the United States of America, the imperialist powers have set up a broad system of military-political blocs. The bellicose forces of imperialism do not confine themselves to preparing for aggression. Lately they have resorted to armed action against the liberation movement. Glaring examples of this are the US intervention in

Vietnam and the Israeli aggression against the Arab states.

The working-class and communist parties must counter the imperialists' attempts to carry out their "global strategy" against the liberation movement with efforts to set up a world-wide front of revolutionary struggle, to rally all the progressive forces. The communist parties are in the vanguard of the movement of the revolutionary forces in the world. Consequently, they are specially responsible for rallying these forces and for consistently implementing the ideas of proletarian internationalism.

This responsibility is greatly increased by the serious differences which have become apparent in the communist movement itself. The situation is all the more grave since China, the socialist country with the largest population, finds itself, because of the dictates of its leaders, in the position of opposing the other socialist countries, with the biggest communist party, the Chinese Party, torn away from the world communist movement. The tendency to break away and withdraw from the common struggle has become apparent among certain other parties and among the ranks of the liberation movement. Naturally, such a state of affairs weakens the world revolutionary movement and only plays into the hands of its enemy, the imperialists.

Seizing on the differences among the communist parties, imperialism is trying to strike back at the world liberation movement in different areas of the world. At the same time the imperialists have considerably stepped up their ideological offensive in order to undermine the communist and revolutionary movement from within. They are sparing no effort to whip up feelings of mistrust and enmity among the peoples; they are trying to find a weak point in

the camp of the liberation forces, and above all, to influence those people who, due to a lack of ideological maturity and stability, are more likely to be susceptible to bourgeois propaganda. The imperialists have been particularly counting on nationalism.

It is apparent that life and the conditions of the present-day struggle make unity in the ranks of the communist movement more essential than ever before. However, this unity will not come spontaneously, by itself. It requires the persistent efforts of all Marxist-Leninist parties and all communists.

The main prerequisite for international solidarity of the communists is their ideological unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. This unity reflects the identity of the goals of the communists and their agreement on the basic means, the main tactics of struggle.

In their time Marx, Engels and Lenin had to uphold the theory of scientific communism from attempts to distort it. On the basis of this theory they elaborated the strategy and tactics of the workers' and communist movement.

At the present stage of the liberation movement the ideological unity of the communists has been embodied in their jointly elaborated programme, the documents of the 1957 and 1960 conferences of the communist and workers' parties in Moscow. The common platform of the communist parties is based on the common appraisal of the main phenomena and developments of today and contains common conclusions regarding the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The majority of the communist parties regard the basic principles underlying the documents of the 1957 and 1960 conferences to be still valid. This, however, does not mean that those principles need no

further elaboration. On the contrary, the changes in the international situation since 1960, new phenomena with respect to the liberation movement urgently call for a more profound analysis of the situation, and further elaboration of the fundamental problems of the world communist movement. The common ideological platform likewise does not imply that its principles should be applied in one and the same way, according to a single yardstick, in all countries. Lenin repeatedly stressed the need for the most thorough appraisal of the specific features of a concrete situation in implementing the general principles of Marxism.

The effectiveness of internationalism is an important condition for rallying the world communist movement. A true internationalist is a man of deed and not empty talk. The efficacy of internationalism is today manifested first of all in the concrete actions by the communists who seek to thwart imperialism's intensified intrigues. An example of this is the support given to the Vietnamese people who are fighting the aggression of American imperialism.

One way of strengthening international solidarity of the communist parties is to study and implement the experience of the world revolutionary movement. It is necessary to learn from one another, to compare experiences, making use of everything that is of value, in the communist movement. Lenin stressed time and again that one of the conditions permitting the victory of the Bolshevik party was that it had never failed to consider "the latest word" in the political experience of the international workers' revolutionary movement, to digest this "word," to apply it to the concrete conditions of the liberation struggle in Russia.

The elaboration and implementation of correct norms and forms of relationship among the

communist parties is of great importance for rallying the communist movement. Marxist-Leninist parties are detachments of one movement cemented by common interests and aims. Yet each party represents a national unit acting within a certain country. This predetermines the pattern of relationships among the communist parties. All of them are equal and completely independent. Marxism-Leninism maintains that independence of the communist parties is inseparably tied with unity of the world communist movement. The fact that the Marxist-Leninist parties are independent increases their responsibility for the common cause and contribution to the international struggle of all the working people.

Relationships between individual parties are perfected with the development of the international communist movement. The scope and nature of this movement no longer permits its guidance from a single centre. The diversified content of the communist movement can no longer be compressed into the framework of a centralised organisation. Communist parties have become more mature and experienced. They are capable of acting independently. The 1957 and 1960 conferences of representatives of communist and workers' parties have determined new forms of international ties among the Marxist-Leninist parties. These include bilateral and multi-lateral meetings, conferences, consultations, and meetings of all the parties. These meetings are held frequently to work out a common ideological platform, exchange experience, coordinate political action of general significance.

International proletarian discipline is a logical requirement of proletarian internationalism. It is not stipulated in any of the international charters, it stems from the very nature of the communist movement which is profoundly in-

ternationalist. This means, in particular, that there cannot be unity of the communist parties unless each party observes voluntarily its commitments to the world communist and workers' movement.

International proletarian discipline is based on each party's awareness of the historic role of the communist movement, and, consequently, of the responsibility communists bear for the future of the world revolutionary movement. In addition this entails self-discipline which also stems from the communist parties' responsibility to the international communist movement. Profound awareness of the importance of unity of the communist movement, the conscientious and honest attitude of communists to their international commitments ensure the further rallying of the world communist movement, its further successes. The international solidarity of fighters against imperialism is a basic source of the achievements of the world revolutionary movement. The 1917 October Revolution in Russia, the emergence of the world socialist system, the successes of the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples and their social progress were possible because of the alliance and mutual support of the revolutionary forces, the cooperation and solidarity of the working class and the working people in the different countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism. The world revolutionary movement had to pay dearly for lack of unity in the ranks of the revolutionary and liberation forces at certain stages of history. It caused many failures and defeats, and hampered the development of the world revolutionary process.

The internationalist nature of the workers' and communist movement does not exclude the emergence of nationalistic tendencies. Lenin felt that the vestiges of nationalism would be one

of the hardest things to overcome in the minds of people. Nationalism, mistrust and enmity were a result of the policy of violence, wars and oppression, and in some cases attempts to exterminate whole nations, pursued by the exploiting classes. In the hands of the bourgeoisie nationalism is one of the main means of trying to prevent the working people of different countries from uniting, of splitting the workers' movement thereby preserving its class positions.

Lenin repeatedly warned the workers' movement of the dangerous consequences of nationalism. He constantly fought against those who walled themselves off from the general movement by setting up national barriers. "...one who has adopted the standpoint of nationalism naturally arrives at the desire to erect a Chinese Wall around his nationality, his national working-class movement; he is unembarrassed... that by his tactics of division and dismemberment *he is reducing to nil* the great call for the rallying and unity of the proletarians of all nations, all races and all languages." ¹

Nationalistic trends are still apparent in the workers' and in the communist movement. Under the pretext of "independence" certain communist parties isolate themselves from the common struggle confining themselves to national affairs.

What is the reason for manifestations of nationalism in the communist and revolutionary movement?

The uneven development of the world revolutionary process is especially evident today. Certain countries, including the socialist ones, have different histories. They differ in their economic, social and political development and in their national culture and the psychology of their people. Likewise, the communist parties

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 520-521.

function under different conditions; they differ as to their experiences, their strength and influence on the masses, their methods and forms of activity. Consequently, they differ in their approach to general problems of the world communist and liberation movement. These differences at times exceed the limit beyond which renunciation of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism begins.

The present era is a period of rapid growth of national awareness. This is due to the establishment of working people's power in a number of countries, to their attaining national independence, and defending their national sovereignty and dignity from the encroachments by imperialist forces.

The danger of nationalistic phenomena appearing is greatest in those countries where the liberation struggle takes on an obviously national character. Many peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have used slogans of national independence in the struggle against imperialism. Lenin recognized the progressive, democratic content of nationalism of the oppressed peoples insofar as it was directed against foreign oppressors, against colonialism. But if nationalism is preserved in the course of social transformations, it takes on reactionary features and trends.

Marxism-Leninism takes into consideration the vitality and danger of vestiges of nationalism which are manifested more frequently and noticeably among the petty-bourgeoisie and backward sections of the population that have not gone through the school of internationalist education. These vestiges last for a time even after the victory of the socialist revolution, for it is impossible immediately to do away with economic and cultural inequality, to eradicate the traces of abnormal relations among nations

inherited from capitalism. Under certain conditions nationalistic vestiges can become revived and played up unless steps are taken to counteract them. Referring to such phenomena, Lenin warned of the particular vitality and danger of the prejudices of national egotism and national narrow-mindedness in countries which had long been under imperialist domination where productive forces were poorly developed.

And, finally, in certain cases splitting tendencies in the communist movement can be explained by the heterogeneous social composition of the communist parties. After the Second World War ideologically and politically immature non-proletarian elements joined the ranks of a number of communist parties. These elements are highly susceptible to bourgeois propaganda, revisionism and reformism. They are influenced by petty-bourgeois trends and moods with the result that nationalism has found soil for developing in some communist parties.

The communist parties, especially those in power, have vast possibilities for educating their membership and all the working people in the spirit of internationalism. These parties can successfully resist nationalistic tendencies. It all depends on the ideological and political maturity of the communist parties and their leaders, on their willingness, and awareness of the need to place the common interests of the world communist movement above local, national interests, on their concern for the common cause. After coming to power the Chinese Communist Party, which had led the national-liberation revolution, was in a position to start educating the working masses in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and to prevent nationalism from flourishing. The basic Marxist-Leninist ideas in this regard were available to the party leadership. They could also heed the experience of the Soviet Un-

ion and the other socialist countries. These countries had contributed to the victory of the Chinese Revolution and given China all-round fraternal aid in the building of socialism that enhanced the impact of the ideas of internationalism on China. However, instead of benefiting from such favourable conditions to prevent the negative aspects of nationalism from making headway among the petty-bourgeoisie and the backward sections of the working people, the Chinese leaders themselves turned out to be captivated by nationalism. Instead of coping with this dangerous affliction, they began with separate nationalistic mistakes and deteriorated to open and extreme nationalism—bellicose chauvinism.

Consequently, opposition to nationalistic phenomena must come, above all, from the communist parties and communists.

Education of the working masses in the spirit of internationalism is an important way of opposing nationalism. It means explaining to the masses the internationalist nature of the world revolutionary movement, the community of interests of the working class and the working people of all countries in the struggle against the common enemy. In present conditions it is of utmost importance for the masses to understand the need for solidarity and mutual assistance among the basic detachments of the world revolutionary movement: socialism, the working class in the developed capitalist countries and the liberation movement in the developing countries. And above all one must understand the necessity for close unity and cooperation among the socialist countries, the main revolutionary force of our time.

Another important means of internationalist education of the masses is the study of the experience of the communist parties of other countries, of the international liberation movement. This helps to improve the activity of individual

communist parties, to avoid mistakes and counter nationalistic tendencies. Knowledge of the life and struggle of other peoples, meetings and direct contacts with representatives of fraternal parties and mass organisations is of great benefit in this respect.

Internationalist education is a long process which requires a great deal of effort, patience and tact. "We must be very cautious and patient, and make concessions to the survivals of national distrust. . . because the national distrust. . . is often extremely tenacious, and haste might only intensify it, in other words, jeopardise the cause of complete and ultimate unity."¹

On the other hand, internationalism is fostered by irreconcilable and determined struggle against reactionary nationalism. Lenin wrote that "the class-conscious workers combat *all* national oppression and *all* national privileges, but they do not confine themselves to that. They combat all, even the most refined, nationalism, and advocate not only the unity, but also the *amalgamation* of the workers of *all* nationalities in the struggle against reaction and against bourgeois nationalism in all its forms."²

The communist movement has acquired much experience on how to combat various manifestations of nationalism in the workers' movement and in its own ranks. Lenin guided the Communist Party of the Soviet Union when it was faced with the highly complex conditions of a multi-national state, in a consistent and uncompromising struggle against nationalism. All Marxist-Leninist parties come up against nationalism in one way or another. Reactionary nationalism, whatever its origin, bourgeois or petty-bourgeois, or the slogans it uses as a cover, is always a

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 293-294.

² V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 19, p. 548.

weapon of imperialism. It is especially dangerous when it penetrates the ranks of the communist movement; the more so if it takes hold in a communist party in power. That is why consistent struggle against nationalism is an indispensable condition for the restoration of unity of the international communist movement on the firm basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Unity of the world anti-imperialist forces is of decisive importance for the destiny of the national-liberation movement of the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Lenin demanded the revolutionary unity of the working classes of the East and the West, unity based on the principles of proletarian internationalism. Lenin ardently called on the people of the East to join in the general struggle of the proletariat of other countries.

In the name of revolutionary unity Lenin insisted that "the Communist International's entire policy on the national and the colonial questions should rest primarily on a closer union of the proletarians and the working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie. This union alone will guarantee victory over capitalism, without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible."¹

Lenin waged a persistent struggle for strict adherence to the principles of proletarian internationalism in relations between communists and in all revolutionary work. Noting the important role the oppressed people were to play in the struggle against imperialism, Lenin at the same time stressed that the decisive role in this struggle would be played by the victorious working class

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 146.

of the socialist countries and the proletariat of the West. When the Indian communist Roy tried to assert that the fate of the revolutionary movement in Europe wholly depended on the development of the revolution in the East, Lenin sharply criticised his position.

It is instructive to recall Lenin's criticism of Roy's concepts now, when the splitting Mao Tse-tung group, which claims hegemony in the world communist movement, is trying to prove that the centre of the world revolutionary movement has shifted to Asia, and that "the wind from the East is stronger than the wind from the West."

Maoism, which divides people according to the colour of their skin and where they live, and which is destroying their militant unity, is acting contrary to Lenin's teaching, against the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national-liberation struggle.

Lenin left the communists of the East an invaluable theoretical heritage. He provided an example for the practical application of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism depending on the concrete situation and specific features of the countries of the East. Lenin urged "to seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle *a single* international task: victory over opportunism and Left doctrinairism within the working-class movement."¹

Leninism is of great significance for the struggling people in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It would be no exaggeration to say, wrote the General Secretary of the Indian Communist party Adjoy Ghosh, that not a single name in these countries, which once were "outside of history," has ever been as popular as the name of Lenin,

¹ V. Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

and no teaching has ever become such a guiding star as Leninism.

The people of the former colonies and dependent countries have risen to active political life. They are marking the coming birth centenary of Lenin with new successes in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, freedom and socialism. This struggle is expanding under Lenin's revolutionary slogan "Oppressed peoples and workers of all lands, unite!"

«Ленин и современные проблемы
национального освободительного движения»

на английском языке

Цена 38 коп.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

